

5594. Also, petition from 600 Knights of Columbus members of Manitowoc, Wis., protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5595. By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of sundry citizens of the tenth district of New Jersey, protesting against the occupation of Germany by the French colonial troops; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5596. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Citizens' Medical Reference Bureau, New York, in opposition to compulsory medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5597. Also, petition of the American Chamber of Commerce of the Philippine Islands, asking for an amendment of the income tax laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5598. By Mr. OSBORNE: Petition of Thomas L. Cheek and 43 other citizens of Venice, Calif., requesting an amendment to the Volstead enforcement law and protesting against the so-called Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5599. By Mr. PAIGE: Petition of sundry citizens of the third district of Massachusetts, opposing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5600. Also, petition of city council of the city of Fitchburg, Mass., relative to the exorbitant prices now being charged for coal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5601. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Maud I. Murchie, State supervisor of teacher training for home economics for the State of California, of Sacramento, Calif., and Agnes E. MacPherson, chairman home economics department, southern branch, University of California, urging support of the Fess bill, providing additional funds for home economics education; to the Committee on Education.

5602. Also, petition of Henry McManus, of Hot Springs, S. Dak., relative to the salaries of Congressmen, Senators, and the Vice President; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5603. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Knights of Columbus, of Ilion, N. Y., against the enactment of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5604. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of commissioner of agriculture, A. W. Gilbert, of the department of agriculture of the State of Massachusetts, asking that the appropriation for controlling the European corn borer be put back to \$400,000; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5605. Also, petition of Michael Davitt Council, American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, asking American recognition of the Irish republic and protesting against the deportation of Lord Mayor O'Callaghan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5606. Also, petition of the American Stay Co., of East Boston, Mass., regarding the packers' bill (S. 3944); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5607. Also, petition of members of the Mayor MacCurtain Council of the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, West Newton, Mass., protesting against the deportation of Lord Mayor O'Callaghan; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5608. Also, petition of the St. Alphonsus Association, of Boston, Mass., and 5,000 citizens of St. Joseph's Church, of Boston, Mass., against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5609. Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of the Philippine Islands, asking an amendment to the income tax laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5610. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of certain citizens of Tollesboro, Ky., protesting against the right to vote being denied to certain classes of citizens; to the Committee on the Census.

5611. Also, petition of Maj. John McBride Council of American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, Roxbury, Mass., asking the dismissal of Admiral Sims from the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5612. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of the Frank X. Sczygiel Post, No. 32, of the American Legion, at Marion, the Gerald A. Hoskin Post, American Legion, at Oberon, and the Florence Kimball Post, No. 7, American Legion, at Lisbon, all in the State of North Dakota, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide better hospitalization facilities, etc., for disabled war veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5613. Also, petition of Northwestern Lumbermen's Association, of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring an amendment to the transportation act and protesting against the proposed duty on lumber imported from Canada; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5614. Also, petition of grain growers of North Dakota, in convention at Fargo, N. Dak., favoring the development of an economical method of marketing farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 9, 1921.

Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., the Chaplain, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we bless Thee for all the mercies with which Thou art crowning our days. We look to Thee for help in the duties awaiting us, and ask where there is sorrow that there may be the balm of Thy presence and helpfulness. Amid all the contingencies of life may we know that a good and gracious God directs our ways to His own glory and for our good. We ask it in Christ's name. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Saturday, February 5, 1921, when, on request of Mr. McKELLAR and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

## FINAL ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, certificates of the governors of Mississippi, Tennessee, and Texas of the final ascertainment of electors for President and Vice President in their respective States at the election November 2, 1920, which were ordered to lie on the table.

## REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year ended October 31, 1920 (being vol. 1), which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

## DAMAGE CLAIMS FOR RIVER COLLISIONS (S. DOC. NO. 378).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$1,200.11 to pay claims for damages by river collisions, river and harbor work, which have been adjusted and settled by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC-LAND WITHDRAWALS AND RESTORATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of withdrawals and restorations of public lands, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. H. Overhue, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 15836) to amend the transportation act, 1920, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed with an amendment the bill (S. 578) providing for the survey of public lands remaining unsurveyed in the State of Florida, with a view to satisfying the grant in aid of schools made to said State under the act of March 3, 1845, and other acts amendatory thereof, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A joint resolution relating to duty on lumber. (Introduced by Mr. Neuman).

Whereas the present housing shortage is a matter of deep national concern, the stimulation of home construction being a vital need of the Nation, and anything that would add to the already high cost of building should fall of legislative sanction; and  
Whereas the cost of lumber production in the United States is lower than in any other country in the world, the American mill therefore needing no tariff to protect it; and  
Whereas a duty placed on lumber imported from Canada would operate to increase the cost to the ultimate consumer and thereby permit the increased financial burden to thousands of farmers and home builders of this country for the benefit of a selected few; and  
Whereas such a tariff is against the best interests and general welfare of the public, would compel excessive depletion of our own timber resources, and would invite retaliatory measures on the part of Canada to the extreme detriment of all lines of manufacture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the Senate concurring), That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States be, and they hereby are, urged to refrain from placing a duty on lumber imported from the Dominion of Canada; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the chief clerk be, and he is hereby, instructed to mail a copy of these resolutions to each Member of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from Minnesota.

OSCAR ARNSEN,  
Chief Clerk House of Representatives.  
GEO. W. PEACHEY,  
Secretary of the Senate.

ST. PAUL, February 2, 1921.

Mr. WARREN presented a telegram in the nature of a petition (signed by E. C. Bowman) of the Farm Bureau of Sheridan County, of Sheridan, Wyo., praying that the appropriation be increased for distribution of thoroughbred stallions throughout the country by the Federal Remount Service, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Lowell Trades and Labor Council, of Lowell, Mass., favoring immediate resumption of trade relations with soviet Russia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution of the Thomas Ashe Council, American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, of Holyoke, Mass., protesting against deporting the lord mayor of Cork, Ireland, D. J. O'Callaghan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution of the Massachusetts Federation of Churches, of Boston, Mass., favoring the disarmament of all nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MOSES presented a memorial of Rev. J. H. Cormier, representing several hundred Catholic and non-Catholic citizens of Salmon Falls, N. H., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to create a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MYERS. I present telegrams in the nature of memorials in opposition to the Smith-Towner educational bill from St. Mary's Branch of the National Council of Catholic Women, of Helena; Isabel McGrade, of Libby; Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Tefeau, of Libby; Mr. and Mrs. F. Parsyck, of Libby; and Mr. and Mrs. P. J. Shea, of Libby; all in the State of Montana, which I move be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TOWNSEND (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented memorials of Branch No. 110, L. C. B. A., of Detroit; Rev. D. J. Breauil, of Houghton; Rev. A. Wolny, pastor of St. Joseph's Church, of Houghton; Rev. H. Tran, pastor of Mount Carmel Church, of Franklin Mine; A. Cubr, president of the St. Stephen Bohemian Roman Catholic Society, of Detroit; and P. C. Ryan, pastor of St. Mary's Church, of Adrian, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to create a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a petition of the Rotary Club, of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to improve the facilities and service of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and to further amend and modify the war-risk insurance act, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WOLCOTT presented petitions of Kate Dougherty, Rosalie F. Pool, Paul Dougherty, Z. A. Pool, C. W. Zolper, James A. Harty, Cecilia M. Hamill, Lucy Peach, Nan A. Neary, Pauline E. Piebling, William J. Reader, jr., Ellen V. O'Dwyer, and Helen Gleeson, all of Wilmington, Del., and sundry citizens of Milford, Del., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to create a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. WILLIS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against the extension of loans to Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Marietta, Columbus, St. Bernard, Kalida, and St. Stephen, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to create a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BECKHAM, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4912) to authorize the appointment of an ordnance storekeeper in the Army, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 767) thereon.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 4991) for the relief of Kristina Furtjak (Rept. No. 768); and

A bill (S. 4992) for the relief of William E. Lewis (Rept. No. 769).

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, reported a bill (S. 5002) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, which was read twice by its title and, with the accompanying report (No. 770), placed on the calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15546) to repeal certain portions of an act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war," approved June 5, 1920, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 771) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15901) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported it favorably with amendments and submitted a report (No. 772) thereon.

#### SUSPENSION OF NAVAL BUILDING PROGRAM.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I submit a report from the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ask that it may be printed in the RECORD and as a Senate document.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator does not want the report printed as a public document, does he?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes. It is on the Borah resolution. I think it ought to be printed as a Senate document. It is a very important resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not very often that reports of committees are printed as public documents.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is nearly always done if the report is upon a special matter, under a special direction of Congress or upon a special resolution of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. They are usually printed as committee reports, but if the Senator wants it done I have no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Washington whether this is the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs that he has just offered?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes.

Mr. KING. I do not know whether or not it is necessary to obtain permission from the Senate, but I should like to have an additional day or two in which to file a minority report. I give notice, at least, that if I can find time I shall file a minority report in addition to the report submitted by the majority of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it will be so ordered.

The report is as follows:

[Senate Report No. 766, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session.]

#### SUSPENSION OF THE UNITED STATES NAVAL BUILDING PROGRAM.

Mr. POINDEXTER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, submitted the following report (pursuant to S. Res. 433):

The Committee on Naval Affairs, which was directed by a Senate resolution adopted on January 25, 1921, to report to the Senate whether in its opinion it is practical and also a sound policy to suspend the naval building program now in progress for a period of six months have considered the questions contained in the resolution and report that in the opinion of your committee it is not practical and is not a sound policy to suspend the naval construction program of the United States now in progress for a period of six months, nor at all, and submit in support of this recommendation the following data and information, including a letter from the Chief of the Navy General Board to the Secretary of the Navy, as follows:

FEBRUARY 2, 1921.

HON. CARROLL S. PAGE,

Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs,  
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am in receipt of your communication of the 26th ultimo inclosing a copy of Senate resolution No. 433, introduced by Senator BORAH and adopted by the Senate, "directing the Committee on Naval Affairs to report to the Senate as to the policy of suspending the present naval building program for six months to the end that investigation may be had as to what constitutes a modern fighting navy."

On the 22d of January I addressed a letter to the General Board, directing the board to make study and investigation with reference to the type of ship which will form the main strength of the navies of the world in the future. I called their attention to the prediction that the time would come when the battleship will no longer form the backbone of the fleet, but that ships of the air and ships of the submarine type will be the main strength of the navies of the future. I requested them to take this matter under consideration and submit the mature judgment of the board after investigation.

In answer to this letter to the General Board, I am in receipt of a letter from the Chief of Operations, Admiral Coontz, conveying with his approval the report of the General Board, signed by Rear Admiral Charles J. Badger, chairman of the executive committee.

I am sending this to you as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate and the committee with my approval.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELA.



FEBRUARY 2, 1921.

From: Senior member.  
 To: Secretary of the Navy.  
 Subject: Design of battleships.  
 Reference: (a) Department's letter of January 22, 1921.  
 Inclosure: (A) Copy of reference (a).

In compliance with the letter of the Secretary of the Navy, dated January 22, 1921, the General Board has carefully considered the question of design in construction of battleships and of their value in the composition of the fleet.

2. For 20 years the General Board has been charged with the duty of recommending to the Navy Department the proper types of ships for the Navy, each in due proportion. Particularly since the close of the recent war activities more than two years ago the General Board has devoted itself to a study of changes proper to adopt in the composition of the fleet in view of the experience of four years of war. The important facts regarding the naval operations of the war are already generally known, and further delay of six months or any other period for the study of types of ships is neither necessary nor advisable.

#### CONCENTRATION OF POWER IS SOUND TACTICS.

3. Concentration of power in attack is the fundamental basis of all warlike operations, ashore and afloat. Naval concentration of power has been in the main fighting ships of a fleet from the ancient galley period to the present time, and the strength of navies has always been based upon the number and power of its ships of the fighting line; that is, of its battleships.

4. Types change as advance is made in the mechanical arts, arts and sciences, and in invention; but the general principle of concentration of power in ships that can take and keep the sea at all times and in all weathers, that can deliver and receive the heaviest blows, and that can overcome the strongest ships that may be brought against them will continue as long as navies exist.

5. The rapid progress during the last half century in naval construction and maritime inventions in motive power, ordnance and armor, in torpedoes, explosives, and accessories has so increased the power and consequent cost of battleships as to make their acquisition and maintenance a financial burden of first importance to any nation, however rich. Naturally, any scheme, proposition, or invention which appears to offer a less expensive, shorter road to victory is most attractive and generally finds enthusiastic supporters.

#### SURPRISE, RUSE, AND STRATAGEM VERSUS KNOCKOUT BLOWS.

6. It will be found on analysis that the arguments against the expensive capital ship are based upon the old fallacy that war can be cheaply won by hitting, dodging, and running. This belief is usually advanced by the weaker opponent, who endeavors to substitute surprise, ruse, and stratagem for powerful, knockout blows. At times it influences stronger nations, who see, or hope they see, some short and more economical road to success, due to new inventions, than that afforded by the slower, normal advance in naval methods and material.

7. Time and again the naval policy of maritime nations has been influenced by these arguments. Reliance upon speed and commerce destroying had its day, until it became evident that speed without punch was insufficient to win a war.

8. In the early eighties, when the automobile torpedo began to develop as a weapon of fair accuracy, the immediate doom of the battleship was prophesied. A single torpedo launched from a boat costing less than \$100,000 was to destroy a battleship costing millions. The answer to this soon came in increased underwater protection, torpedo defense batteries, and in the larger, faster, better armed, and more costly torpedo-boat destroyer, which drove the smaller torpedo vessel from the sea and took permanent place in the auxiliary forces of the fleet, at enhanced cost to its construction and maintenance.

9. Much was expected in the late war of large, fast, well-drilled squadrons of torpedo-boat destroyers that would launch a flock of torpedoes against the capital ships in battle formation with fatal effect. At the battle of Jutland, when these tactics were tried out they failed. Several ships were hit but not destroyed. The British battleship *Marlborough* after being torpedoed remained in the line and got safely back to port. The German ship *Seydlitz* had the same experience. Only one ship, of an older type, the *Pommern*, is reported to have been sunk, and that at night and after the battle. Nothing was accomplished in the battle in the way of destruction of capital ships by torpedoes, though great numbers were launched. Destroyer met destroyer, light cruiser light cruiser, and the battleships held their places in the line. The most serious damage to the ships in this battle was due to the great gun.

10. The fast light cruiser, raider, commerce destroyer, were again tried out in the World War. The Von Spee squadron, the *Emden*, and a few other vessels of similar types brought a certain amount of distinction to the German Navy, but as the German battle fleet could not support them they eventually succumbed to superior British force which commanded the sea. Speed and dodging again failed.

11. To-day the opponents of the battleship are basing their arguments upon the present and prospective, especially the prospective, development of submarines and aircraft. It is the old battle of words over again, like that of the torpedo against the big ship, the gun against armor, speed against concentrated fighting power. We are asked to accept hopes for accomplishment.

12. During the late war the submarine, a new weapon never before tried in war, received enormous development. Its employment against certain types of vessels, particularly slow, unprotected merchant vessels, was entirely unexpected. The submarine is the most successful weapon in its qualities of concealment and surprise yet advanced. It came very near winning the war for Germany. But, as always, necessity and invention combined found means to meet the menace and reduce it to controllable limits.

13. The successful employment of the destroyer and other speedy vessels with their depth bombs, the motor boat with its listening devices, submarine against submarine, developed a defense against submarine attack to a point where it was successfully met. It took a long time, but again surprise and dodging failed.

14. The capital ship survived this, perhaps the most serious danger to which it has yet been exposed, and further improvements in underwater protection as well as in other ways have greatly minimized it. As a matter of fact, throughout the war though the cruising ground of the grand fleet was infested by submarines, eventually brought to a high state of perfection by the Germans, not a single battleship of that fleet was sunk or even very seriously injured by submarine attack. The protective measures adopted were successful and the grand fleet frequently

traversed the North Sea and adjacent waters unharmed and at will. There is no reason to believe that the defense along these lines will not continue to keep pace with the offense.

#### AVIATION.

15. Finally come the bomb and torpedo carrying aircraft to contest the supremacy of the capital ship, as well as of all surface vessels. Great things, not yet accomplished, are predicted for the inventors and enthusiastic supporters of these new weapons, but if past experience has any value, it may be as confidently predicted that equally fertile invention will provide means for meeting the future development of these weapons and that they, like their dangerous predecessors, will continue to be only adjuncts of the fleet. Already aircraft have been successfully employed in war against aircraft.

16. No one can foretell what the developments in aviation may bring in the modification of present accepted types of surface vessels, but it may be confidently asserted that changes of type due to this influence will be slow and will not seriously affect the value of the ships now built or to be built in the near future. Changes in military characteristics of battle and other surface ships are frequent in these days of progress in invention, but no revolutionary change is to be expected. Secrecy as to basic characteristics can not be maintained, and means of defense move in parallel lines and at about equal speed with those of offense.

17. The unlikely may happen, and the protective measures and devices needed for the survival of the capital ship may outweigh and overshadow the value of such ships as primary weapons. Before such a condition is reached, however, the new weapons now under trial will have to attain a general efficiency far in excess of anything they now possess. Predictions are one thing, actualities are another. It would be the height of unwisdom for any nation possessing sea power to pin its faith and change its practice upon mere theories as to the future development of new and untried weapons. As yet the protected gun is the most generally effective weapon in existence for naval use. But that fact does not relieve us of the necessity of developing to the utmost new weapons and inventions as rapidly as possible.

18. At the present time the defense of surface ships against aircraft attack, whether by bombs or torpedoes, seems fairly well solved. It consists mainly in meeting aircraft with aircraft. The limitations of aircraft are such that there is no reason why both sides, properly prepared, should not have aircraft at hand when the time and place for their use arises. Victory in the air will then depend upon the greater efficiency in personnel and material in the air service. Hence the need for immediate training and preparation in aviation.

19. Aviation development over the land has progressed far more than over the water. The difficulties of the effective use of aircraft over water against ships are incomparably greater. During the war the damage to surface vessels from aircraft was practically negligible. It is easy to lay a bomb on the deck of a ship, explode it from a safe place, and then exclaim in wonder at the damage it has caused. But it is a very different matter to place that same bomb from the air when under gunfire or attack from other planes. The same is true of the torpedo launched from aircraft. The characteristic weaknesses of the torpedo under the necessary conditions of operation make a hit from the air difficult under the best of conditions, but conceding that it can be done, tests under peace conditions must of necessity be inconclusive as to actual performance under war conditions.

20. There is no doubt, however, that the future employment of aircraft in connection with naval operations will introduce new problems of attack and defense of far-reaching importance. They will become increasingly valuable adjuncts of the fleet.

21. The General Board, in its annual report, dated September 24, 1920, stated as follows:

"It is not too much to say that the influence of seaplanes upon scouting and information gathering duties may revolutionize former naval practice along these lines, though the General Board does not believe that the necessity for surface vessels of the scout or cruiser type will be in any great degree impaired by the use of aircraft as information gatherers."

"Surface vessels will always be needed for use under weather and other conditions when aircraft could not be employed—for the patrol of sea routes, the protection of lines of communication, escort of convoys, screens for fleets, and numerous other duties for which aircraft are not suited."

"Airplane carriers are a development of the war. They are to carry airplanes in considerable numbers from which aircraft may fly and return as to a base. Such vessels should be considered as an absolutely essential type in a modern fleet. For the United States Navy they are urgently needed for training the air and the fleet personnel in the use of aircraft in connection with fleet organization and operations."

#### COMPOSITION OF THE MODERN FLEET.

22. The composition of a war fleet is becoming more and more complex. It follows the law of increase in size and cost, as do all great modern organizations. But the principle is the same now as in the days of Nelson and before. Ships of different types had to be provided for the duties which the state of naval warfare then demanded. Hence, the ship of the line (battleship), in which the main reliance was placed for the destruction of enemy sea power. Frigates, sloops, and smaller craft were provided for information gathering, blockading, ocean patrol, convoying, commerce destroying, and the clearing of the seas of enemy craft of similar types, besides store and supply ships for fleet maintenance.

23. To-day the fleet organization is still based upon the great fighting ships, with such auxiliaries as modern progress has made necessary for the prosecution of naval warfare. As new weapons have been invented or old ones have been increased in power means have been found to meet them. The defense has kept pace with the offense, and victory depends, as before, upon efficient organization, the number and power of the fighting ships, and upon the training and effectiveness of the personnel.

#### THE BATTLESHIP—THE BASIS OF SEA POWER.

24. Comment has been made from time to time in the press and elsewhere upon the comparatively little actual fighting done in the late war by the battleship fleets, and the conclusion has been drawn that because of their apparent inactivity they were of no use and could be dispensed with. The important service which they performed was neither generally understood nor appreciated. In reality it was upon the potential fighting power of these ships that the activities of all other naval craft was based. Throughout the war it was the grand fleet at Scapa Flow or thereabouts which controlled the movements

of the enemy ships. It was the sea power vested and latent in the battleships which exercised the pressure upon the enemy which kept the sea routes open to the Allies and kept the German High Sea Fleet in its defended harbors until the morale of its personnel was sapped and the offensive power of that fleet destroyed by inaction.

#### FLEET AND ARMY ORGANIZATION COMPARED.

25. In the organization and operation of an army main dependence is placed upon the slow moving but potentially powerful infantry. Upon it is based the activities of all subsidiary branches of the service—artillery, cavalry, engineers, aircraft—all. Its masses may and generally do lie well behind the advance lines, and not until the necessary preparations have been made by the advanced forces, which it supports, or the movements of the enemy's infantry or other conditions make it necessary or advisable, does it advance to give battle. Upon the size and fighting power of the great masses depends victory or defeat.

26. Similar conditions obtain in the organization and operations of a fleet. The battleship fleet represents the infantry masses in which reside the final and decisive fighting power. The cruisers and destroyers, the submarines and aircraft, all the various subsidiary forces, like those of the Army, base their activities upon the battle fleet which, when the time is opportune, exerts its full power upon the enemy. Similar types will meet similar types, but it is upon the most powerful type of all, the battleship, that the decision will depend.

#### THE BATTLESHIP PARAMOUNT.

27. The General Board in its annual report dated September 24, 1920, stated as follows:

"Nothing that occurred during the World War has served to change the opinion of the General Board as to the vital importance in war of the battleship, the ship that can at once give and take heavy blows."

28. Numerous citations in support of this position might be made from the most distinguished fleet commanders and other experienced officers of the late war. But perhaps it will suffice to quote the British naval opinion as contained in the statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty explanatory of the navy estimates, 1920-21, when presented to Parliament.

#### REMARKS ON THE CAPITAL SHIP.

"There has been some criticism of the maintenance in commission of the present type of vessels, especially in regard to the capital ship. A contrary policy has been openly advocated, this policy being based, it is presumed, on the idea that the battleship is dead and that submersible and air vessels are the types of the future. The naval staff has examined this question with extreme care, and as a result we profoundly dissent from these views."

"In our opinion the capital ship remains the unit on which sea power is built up."

"So far from the late war having shown that the capital ship is doomed, it has on the contrary proved the necessity for that type. On the German side the whole of the submarine campaign against merchant vessels was built up on the power of the high-sea fleet. On the British side the enemy submarines in no way interfered with the movements of capital ships in carrying out operations; destroyer screens, new methods of attack, and altered tactical movements defeated the submarine."

"Nor at present could the Board of Admiralty subscribe to the statement that aircraft have doomed the capital ship. Aircraft are certainly of the highest importance in naval tactics as regards reconnaissance, torpedo attacks, and artillery observation, but their rôle in present circumstances is that of an auxiliary and not of a substitute for the capital ship. The past history of this question must be taken into account; many times has the doom of the battleship been pronounced. The introduction of torpedo craft was believed in certain quarters over 20 years ago to have settled its fate. The Board of Admiralty at the time refused to be carried away by the attractiveness of the idea of building small, cheap torpedo craft instead of battleships, and they proved to be right. History has shown that the introduction of a type to destroy the capital ship has been quickly followed by the evolution of countermeasures which sustain its power."

"We therefore believe that the battleship must remain the principal unit, and that the fleet tactics and tactical training must be carried out with the battle squadron as the main unit. Nevertheless, it must be emphasized that although the battleship remains, its type may require to be altered. Advances in electricity, in the internal-combustion engine, and in science generally will inevitably necessitate an eventual change of type, and it is one of the principal functions of the naval staff to keep continuous watch on scientific development, with the object of insuring that the type of capital ship design meets the requirements of the future. It is even possible that the present battleship will change to one of semisubmersible type, or even of a flying type, but such types are visions of the far future, not practical propositions of the moment. By gradual evolution and development the types forecast may arrive, but the immediate abandonment of the capital ship in favor of a visionary scheme of aircraft and submarines would leave the British Nation destitute of sea power and without the means of progressive training."

29. Certainly there is nothing in that statement, representing the best professional opinion of responsible authority in Great Britain, which throws any doubt upon the value of the battleship.

"We therefore believe that the battleship must remain the principal unit." The statement recognizes that the advance in science generally may require an eventual change of type and that continuous watch on scientific development must be exercised, but there is nowhere any indication that such changes will occur except by "gradual evolution and development." This gradual evolution and development in types has been going on steadily. The battleship of 1920 is a very different creation from that of 1900.

30. Especial attention is invited to the concluding sentences of the statement, as follows:

"It is even possible that the present battleship will change to one of a semisubmersible type, or even of a flying type, but such types are visions of the far future, not practical propositions of the moment. By gradual evolution and development the types forecast may arrive, but the immediate abandonment of the capital ship in favor of a visionary scheme of aircraft and submarines would leave the British Nation destitute of sea power and without the means of progressive training."

31. Much has been made in the public press and elsewhere of the fact that the British Government is not at present building any capital ships. The conclusion is frequently drawn that this cessation is due to doubts as to the efficiency of that type; that the battleship is dead, etc. Nothing in the above-quoted statement by the First Lord of the Admiralty indicates any such belief. Probably the reasons may be found in the

economic situation and to the fact that the British Navy, being now far superior in numbers and power to that of any other, can afford to wait until financial conditions have improved.

#### POLICY OF EQUALITY IN SEA POWER.

32. The United States naval building program since 1903 has consistently tended toward equality of sea power with the strongest. It has been directed against no nation or group of nations. Its continuation has been solely on the ground of national safety.

33. The great merchant fleet that we are now making every effort to create and establish renders more necessary than ever a powerful Navy for its protection. In all history it will be found that no nation has ever been able to establish and maintain a large merchant marine without a corresponding navy to assist and protect it.

34. The building program authorized in 1916 will, if completed, give us for the first time in the Nation's history substantial equality in power, if not in numbers of ships, for our battle fleet.

35. In urging that this equality in power be the continuing naval policy of the United States there is no thought of instituting international competitive building. No other nation can in reason take exception to such a position. In assuming it the United States threatens no other nation or nations by the mere act of placing itself on an equality with the strongest. In can not be justly construed as a challenge. There is no good reason why the United States should not enjoy the trust of other nations to the same extent as she is expected to repose trust in them. A policy of equal or substantially equal armaments may well tend to diminish their growth and lessen the danger of sudden war.

36. The General Board, having kept in touch with naval progress along all lines, reiterates its belief in the battleships as forming the principal units of the fleet. Without them the United States can not hope to cope with existing navies. The board strongly urges that the policy which has characterized our building program since 1903, of eventually creating a navy equal to the strongest, be continued, and that no rest period or limitation of armament be agreed to which will modify the authorized building program of 1916 in numbers, general types, and date of completion. The ships recommended in that program are thoroughly modern, and there is no reason to believe that the developments in submarine and air warfare will seriously detract from their value for many years to come.

37. The completion of that program should not deter us from developing to the utmost new or partly developed weapons—that is, submarines, aircraft, and aircraft carriers—and from making such additions to the fleet as will enable us successfully to develop and use surface, subsurface, and air methods of warfare to the best possible advantage should the necessity ever arise. In the future, as at all times previous to the World War, we shall, in all probability, have to rely solely upon our own state of preparedness.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,  
Washington, January 22, 1921.

To: President General Board, Navy Department.

It seems to be evident that this Congress is not disposed to authorize the construction of any capital ships, and due to the amount of construction work in hand the department has not urged the authorization for any battleships other than those which are now under construction.

The department feels, however, that the question of design in construction of battleships is an important one and demands continued study and investigation. It is noted that this is extensively discussed in the public press, both in America and England, and particularly in England, in regard to the type of ship which will form the main strength of the navies of the world in the future. Some well-known writers are expressing their opinion that the battleship will, at an early date, no longer form the backbone of the fleet, but that ships of the air and ships of the submarine type will be the powerful ships of the future.

The department desires that this matter be taken under consideration by the General Board and analyzed from the different points of view and a report on this general subject be submitted early in February.

JOSEPH DANIELS,  
Secretary of the Navy.

Your committee indorses and approves in the main the observations and conclusions of the foregoing letter. The value and importance of submarines, aircraft, and high explosives are admitted, and the committee recommends that the scientific study and development of all of these means of naval warfare be actively continued. Depth bombs, mines, aerial torpedoes, and high-explosive shells fired from great guns, whether of the howitzer or other types, are all important agencies of attack and defense at sea, and intensive study of their potential uses should be continued with a view of utilizing them to the greatest possible advantage.

If we assume, however, a naval power armed with all these devices, and with destroyers and swift light cruisers, but with no battleships or battle cruisers—and an enemy power equipped with all these and with battleships and battle cruisers in addition—there can be no doubt that in any conflict the power equipped with capital ships would be victorious over its enemy not so equipped. The rival forces of light craft, whether on or below the surface or in the air, would neutralize each other, leaving the power which possessed the heavy ships, armed with great guns, in undisputed control of the sea.

This was substantially the situation at the close of the late World War, with the capital ships of the Allies dominating all the seas of the world, controlling communications, isolating the enemy, cutting off his supplies, and creating a condition which by its effect upon the armies of the belligerents was the predominant influence in crushing the Central Powers and bringing victory to America and the Entente Allies.

As aircraft, artillery, and cavalry are but auxiliaries to the infantry in warfare on land, so the chief function of aircraft, submarines, and light surface craft is that of auxiliaries to the main line heavy fighting ships. In this capacity they are valuable and indispensable, but the nation which depended upon them alone would be completely at the mercy of the nation which possessed all these and heavy fighting ships in addition.

Situated as is the United States, with oceans separating it from other great powers, its first line of defense must necessarily be its Navy, and so long as it has a battle fleet which can hold the sea against attack, both its continental territory and its island possessions, as well as its commerce and the rights and interests of its citizens upon the high seas, are secure—regardless of the comparative size of the armies of the world. On the other hand, if from lack of heavy ships



of the line or other weaknesses, its Navy can not hold the sea against attack, then, even though it might have the greatest army in the world, its island possessions would fall away from it, its commerce would be destroyed, its coasts blockaded and subjected to constant attack.

In view of this importance of sea power to the United States, and the fact that without it we would be at the mercy of other nations, it is the opinion of your committee that this country should maintain a navy at least equal to that of any other power. The lessons of history teach us with indisputable truth that we can not afford to depend for the maintenance of our rights and the defense of the lives and commerce of our citizens upon the mercy, generosity, or good will of other powers with rival and conflicting interests or ambitions.

For these reasons we are of the opinion that there should be no suspension of the present building program of the Navy, which, as at present laid out, is, at the most, only designed to place us upon a footing of equality with any other power upon the sea.

Temporarily to stop work upon ships now being constructed would lead to a complete disorganization of the working forces now engaged upon them, to a deterioration of material, and to a general dislocation of contracts and engagements which would entail enormous losses upon the Government, and make a resumption of the program difficult and costly.

It is estimated by the technical experts of the Navy that the actual loss which would result from a six months' suspension of this work would be between \$15,000,000 and \$25,000,000. Large numbers of workmen would be thrown out of employment, with consequent distress to themselves and their families, compelling them to seek other employment, and rendering difficult or impossible the reassembling of these forces should work upon the ships be resumed. Any such result would give an immense advantage to such other powers as would continue uninterruptedly the construction of their fleets or those already supplied with superior naval power.

It is the opinion of this committee that the United States should have under its control a sufficient force to protect and preserve both its material possessions, the policies it has established, the lives and rights of its citizens, and the principles upon which its government is founded.

Battleships as a constituent part of our fleet are essential to this power, and any interruption or "building holiday" in the work now provided for would seriously retard and might wholly prevent its attainment.

Other powers have not abandoned the battleship as the chief arm of the navy fighting line. The continued reliance of Great Britain upon this arm of the naval service is set out in the address of the First Lord of the Admiralty quoted in the letter of the Navy General Board. Other powers are proceeding with an extended program of battleship construction.

In the building program of 1916 however, 12 of the destroyers and 6 of the submarines therein authorized have not been let to construction contract. These 18 vessels if constructed would cost approximately \$55,000,000. As stated above, the authority for their construction has already been given and the Secretary of the Navy is already authorized by law to make contracts therefor, although appropriations for them have not been made. The Navy General Board has advised the committee that in consideration of the remaining number of destroyers and submarines authorized in the 1916 program, and in view of the development of aerial naval warfare during and since the late World War, it would be advisable to substitute 2 airplane carriers in place of the 12 destroyers, and 6 submarines of the program for which contracts have not been let, at approximately the same cost as these vessels would entail if the original program should be carried out. Upon a thorough consideration of the entire matter, the committee recommends that the 12 destroyers and 6 submarines just mentioned for which contracts have not been let be eliminated from the program and at the same time and as a substitute therefor authority be given for the construction of two airplane carriers of the most modern type and equipment and most advantageous size.

The members of the committee are as anxious to bring about a reduction of armaments and relief from the burdens which those armaments impose upon the nations of the earth as anyone can be, but no disarmament would be of any value unless it was general and, in the case of the great maritime powers, universal. Unhappily this is not the case at the present time, and we must deal with conditions as they exist. For one nation to leave itself exposed to attack while another is preparing all the engines of war would be not only folly but the greatest danger to the peace of the world that could be imagined. We earnestly hope that an agreement may be reached among the nations for a general reduction of armaments, but at the present moment universal disarmament has not been established, and the United States can not leave itself undefended if it is threatened from any quarter. To do so would be a wrong to the American people and no service to the cause of peace.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 4994) to extend rediscount privilege to farm loan bonds, promote their sale, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HEFLIN:

A bill (S. 4995) for the relief of Maj. Francis M. Maddox, United States Army; and

A bill (S. 4996) for the relief of Eugene K. Stoudemire; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 4997) for the relief of Herbert E. Mellstrup (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 4998) authorizing an appropriation for the World's Poultry Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 4999) granting a pension to James Percival (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANDELL:

A bill (S. 5000) directing the Mississippi River Commission to make an examination and survey of the Atchafalaya, Red, and

Black Rivers, and to report plan for protection of their basins from flood waters of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 5001) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase bonds of farm loan banks in order to stabilize the market for such bonds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELKINS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 254) for the bestowal of the congressional medal of honor upon the unknown, unidentified British and French soldiers buried in Westminster Abbey, London, England, and the Arc de Triomphe, Paris, France; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 255) admitting Emil S. Fischer to the rights and privileges of a citizen of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration.

#### AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. McCUMBER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$1,200 to pay Robert W. Farrar for extra and expert services rendered to the Committee on Pensions during the sessions of the Sixty-sixth Congress, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WARREN submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the encouragement of the breeding of riding horses suitable for the Army, etc., from \$100,000 to \$250,000, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted amendments proposing to increase the appropriation for the Air Service from \$19,200,000 to \$19,500,000, and also to increase the appropriation for experimentation, conservation, and production of helium from \$100,000 to \$400,000, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WOLCOTT submitted an amendment providing for a survey of Wilmington Harbor (Brandywine Creek), Del., intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing a survey of Little Creek, Kent County, Del., with the view of providing a direct outlet from the nearest southern bend to Delaware Bay, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

#### ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS.

Mr. SPENCER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 442), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That S. Res. 42, agreed to June 6, 1919, being a resolution authorizing the Committee on Claims to employ an assistant clerk during the Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, at the rate of \$2,200 per annum, said compensation to be paid out of the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate, and which resolution was extended and continued in authority by S. Res. 218, agreed to on November 10, 1919, until the end of the Sixty-sixth Congress, be, and the same is hereby, further extended in full force and effect until the end of the Sixty-seventh Congress.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 15836) to amend the transportation act, 1920, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

#### SURVEY OF PUBLIC LANDS IN FLORIDA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 578) providing for the survey of public lands remaining unsurveyed in the State of Florida, with a view of satisfying the grant in aid of schools made to said State under the act of March 3, 1845, and other acts amendatory thereof.

The amendment of the House was, on page 3, line 7, to strike out all after the word "Provided," where it first occurs, down to and including line 13, and to insert:

*Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be deemed to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office to survey any lands within the exterior boundaries of the Everglades, as defined in Everglades patent No. 187, issued to the State of Florida by the United States under the swamp land act of 1850.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I have examined the amendment and also read the discussion in the House. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

## RELIEF OF DISTRESS ABROAD.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate:

Supplementing my message of January 31, 1921, I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, accompanied by additional papers pertinent to the Senate resolution of January 3, 1921, requesting the Secretary of State to obtain and report to the Senate certain information with respect to the distressful conditions of women and children in foreign lands.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
9 February, 1921.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, February 7, 1921.

The PRESIDENT:

In further response to the Senate's resolution of January 3, 1921, requesting the Secretary of State "to obtain through consular officers or other official representatives of the United States in foreign lands, accurate information as to the actual conditions, and the needs and necessities of the women and children of various distressed nations, countries, or foreign dependencies, and transmit the same to the Senate at the earliest possible moment" and further "to ascertain, if possible, and report to the Senate what the various Governments in which such suffering exists are doing looking toward the alleviation of such distressful conditions," the undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to their transmission to the Senate, if his judgment approve thereof, papers pertinent to the resolution additional to those accompanying the report of the Acting Secretary of State dated January 11, 1921, and of the Secretary of State dated January 31, 1921, and transmitted to the Senate by the President on February 1. These consist of telegrams from the American commissioner at Constantinople, the American chargé d'affaires at Sofia, and the American minister at Prague dated respectively January 25, 25, and 29, 1921.

Respectfully submitted.

BAINBRIDGE COLBY.

Inclosures: As stated above.

[Telegram from American commissioner, Constantinople, Jan. 25, 1921.]  
SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Washington, D. C.:

32. Following from American consul at Beirut, January 25.

Your January 18, 5 p. m. The present organization of the Near East Relief workers in Syria, excluding Aleppo district, is composed of 20 American personnel and 186 native personnel, and maintains orphanages, hospitals, rescue homes, and a sanitarium containing 3,012 orphans and refugee women. General relief is given to 1,363 extra persons. The legitimate call for charity excepting the orphans mentioned above is practically nil. There is a great shortage of labor in Syria and the people have for years been educated to expect relief. No figures are obtainable as to the exact extent of French relief measures, but the method employed is to place needy persons under the care of various French religious societies. The French authorities are capable and have intimated their willingness to assume the American work in this section. A further report will be sent as soon as the French statistics are completed.

BRISTOL.

[Telegram from American representative at Sofia, Jan. 25, 1921.]  
SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Washington, D. C.:

2. January 25, 1 p. m.

The conditions in Bulgaria are good and the Government is willing and able to handle the situation without help from outside. However, there are 7,000 Russian refugees, including 1,000 women and 700 children, mostly destitute. Of this number, 2,000 are unable to work; 4,000 could work, but are unemployed and are consequently dependent upon foreign charity, as the Bulgarian Government can not assist, and little is being done by private charity. Five hundred tons of supplies are being furnished by the American Red Cross, and its representatives recently made investigations in the country and should be prepared to report as to future needs of refugees. There should be an American representative in the country to supervise the distribution of American supplies.

WILSON.

[Telegram from American minister at Prague, Jan. 29, 1921.]

SECRETARY OF STATE,

Washington:

9. January 29, noon.

Department's circular telegram of January 7. There is need of food and clothing for women and children in the mountain districts of western and northern Bohemia north of Trencin Slovak, in some parts of the Carpathian Russian district, and in industrial areas where there is great unemployment. The war has made 400,000 widows and orphans. In some parts of western Bohemia deaths outnumber the births in a ratio of 3 to 1, and 60 per cent of the children examined in the clinics show evidence of malnutrition. The feeding of the children helps the morale of the unemployed. The miners in several districts have agreed to work Sundays and endeavor to increase production from 20 to 30 per cent if they are given additional food and clothing. The people are industrious and anxious to work.

I have been in touch with the work of American relief organizations since its beginning, and in my opinion the European children's fund is carefully handled, with proper regard for American interests, and with a view to turning the work over to local agencies as early as possible. The food distributed is delivered from America at Hamburg. From Hamburg all expense of transportation is paid by the Czecho-Slovak Government. The American contribution totals \$4,004,000 and the contribution of the Czech Government \$887,000 in cash. The Czechs pay the salaries of 4 Americans and 15 Czechs, besides 10,000 native workers. In the beginning there were 40 Americans on the roll. In addition to cash contributions, the Czechs assume payment for transportation, preparation, donation of local foodstuffs, bureaus, etc., indicating complete cooperation on the part of the Czechs and aid equivalent to the support given by Americans.

American relief organizations formerly fed 500,000 children one meal daily; this number is now reduced to 250,000 requiring such aid.

Independent observers report that the Czecho-Slovak Red Cross is making excellent progress in taking over work begun by American Red Cross. Other reports severely criticize its methods, but it is continually improving.

Having once extended relief, America should not withdraw at this time. The food situation generally is good except in the districts mentioned above, but the Government is having great difficulty in obtaining an adequate supply of flour.

Constructive assistance from America in the way of long-term credits for raw materials and diplomatic aid in obtaining prompt distribution of Austro-Hungarian rolling stock would greatly reduce the need for charity, and would be appreciated by a population which is proud of its independence and has no desire to be regarded as an object of charity. A complete report is being sent in a dispatch dated January 25.

CRANE.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be resumed where it was left off on the last occasion when the calendar was called, which is on page 12 of the printed calendar, commencing with Calendar No. 659.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] desires to go on with the sundry civil appropriation bill this morning.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have no objection to that procedure, but under the rule, of course, this is the order of business; and no request having been made to set aside the regular order of business, I think we might proceed until the Senator from Wyoming appears and makes a contrary request.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator yield to me to request that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate, and then I will yield to any other business that is appropriate?

Mr. ROBINSON. I have no objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the unfinished business will be laid before the Senate.

The READING CLERK. A bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum. The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Dillingham	Harris	Kenyon
Borah	Fernald	Harrison	Keyes
Calder	Fletcher	Heblin	King
Capper	Glass	Henderson	Knox
Curtis	Gooding	Johnson, Calif.	Lodge
Dial	Hale	Jones, Wash.	McCumber



McKellar  
Moses  
Myers  
Nelson  
Overman

Phelan  
Robinson  
Sheppard  
Simmons  
Smith, Ariz.

Smoot  
Spencer  
Sterling  
Thomas  
Townsend

Underwood  
Walsh, Mass.  
Warren  
Wolcott

Mr. FERNALD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] are absent on business of the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is detained on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The roll of absentees will be called.

The reading clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. GRONNA, Mr. JONES of New Mexico, Mr. KENDRICK, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. McLEAN, Mr. McNARY, Mr. NEW, Mr. POINDEXTER, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. WALSH of Montana, and Mr. WILLIS answered to their names when called.

Mr. GAY, Mr. TRAMMELL, Mr. COLT, Mr. FRANCE, Mr. RANDELL, Mr. STANLEY, Mr. KELLOGG, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. LENROOT, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. POMERENE, and Mr. CULBERSON entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the business which was before the Senate last evening.

Mr. KING. I object.

Mr. ROBINSON. I hope my friend from Utah will be kind enough to withdraw his objection. I wish to have disposed of some amendments in which I am interested, as I may be compelled to leave the Chamber on account of illness in my family. The amendments to which I refer relate to the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. KING. I was under the impression that it was the desire of our friends upon the other side of the Chamber to speedily prosecute the bill which is before us as the unfinished business—the emergency tariff bill—but in view of the request of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], supplemented by the appeal of my friend from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], I withdraw the objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any further objection? There being no further objection, the unfinished business is temporarily laid aside, and the Chair lays before the Senate House bill 15422.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15422) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the pending bill. To follow the committee amendment which was agreed to on yesterday, after line 10, on page 24, I move to insert the following:

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to take over immediately Fort Logan H. Roots, Ark., with all lands, buildings, and equipment belonging thereto, for the uses contemplated herein: *Provided*, That not exceeding \$250,000 of the amount herein appropriated is authorized to be expended at Fort Logan H. Roots, Ark., in providing and increasing hospital facilities thereat.

This amendment in a different form was presented on yesterday. It was then discussed very fully, and also on a previous occasion. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] indicated at that time that because the information had not been received by the committee that the Surgeon General needed or desired this fort for the uses of the Public Health Service he would not consent to it. That information has been furnished the members of the committee, and I now ask that the amendment may be agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have looked the matter up, and I shall not object to the amendment being incorporated in the bill.

Mr. LODGE. I do not object to the amendment, but I should like to know what it is. There was so much conversation on the floor when the amendment was read that it was impossible to understand it.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is an amendment proposing to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to take over Fort Logan H. Roots, in Arkansas, for hospital purposes.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have one other amendment which I desire to propose, and I ask the attention of the chairman of the committee to the amendment.

I submitted this amendment and had it printed on February 5. It relates to the employment service. In an informal conference with the chairman of the committee I was informed that if the amount of the amendment should be reduced to the amount which was reported, as I understood the chairman, by the House of Representatives in the bill, and which was stricken out in the other House on a point of order, the objection would not be made to the insertion of the amendment. While I think the full amount carried in the amendment as introduced is required for the purposes of the service, and while I think the service could use a great deal more, in view of all the facts surrounding the controversy I am willing to accept that proposition as a basis of compromise. Therefore I modify my amendment so as to carry the sum of \$250,000, if that is satisfactory to the members of the committee, and I have reason to believe that it is.

Mr. THOMAS. Let the amendment be read.

Mr. WARREN. I did not quite understand the amount proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. As I have modified the amendment it carries an appropriation of \$250,000.

Mr. WARREN. The sum should be \$225,000, the same as last year.

Mr. ROBINSON. But I understood the Senator from Wyoming to say that he would be willing to consent to the amount that was reported by the House committee.

Mr. WARREN. That was objected to by the Senate committee.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well; I will accept that amount. I will modify the amendment, and instead of an appropriation of \$250,000 make it \$225,000. In that connection I think it proper to say that I do not believe that sum will be adequate for all the requirements of the service and that the full amount carried in the amendment as originally submitted ought to be appropriated, but I realize the effort that is being made to reduce expenditures and, for my part, I am willing to effectuate that arrangement, if it can be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following amendment:

#### EMPLOYMENT SERVICE.

To enable the Secretary of Labor to foster, promote, to develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, to advance their opportunities for profitable employment by maintaining a national system of employment offices, and to coordinate the public employment offices throughout the country by furnishing and publishing information as to opportunities for employment and by maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several States, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and for their actual necessary traveling expenses while absent from their official station, together with their per diem in lieu of subsistence, when allowed pursuant to section 18 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914; supplies and equipment, telegraph and telephone service, and printing and binding, \$225,000.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the chairman of the committee whether any estimate has been made for that item?

Mr. WARREN. Oh, yes; estimates have been submitted; it is an old matter.

Mr. ROBINSON. Estimates have been submitted for an amount very much larger than that carried by the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. The estimate is for a very large amount. I myself have grave doubt as to the value of the work, but it is one of those matters for which Congress has seen fit to make appropriation. I do not object to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I should like to have information regarding the effect of the amendment which was adopted awhile ago on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas providing for taking over Fort Logan H. Roots. The amount of \$250,000 was authorized to be used for the purpose of putting that property in satisfactory condition. I should like to inquire if the general amount made available for the purpose of increasing hospital facilities at certain forts was also increased?

Mr. ROBINSON. It was not increased. I should be very glad to have it increased if the chairman of the committee should desire that it be done. This amount, I will say, is available out of the \$12,500,000 appropriated for general hospital purposes.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Then, it will not come out of the \$6,100,000 appropriation?

Mr. ROBINSON. No; it follows the committee amendment on page 24, proposing to appropriate \$12,500,000.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Very well.

Now, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether it will not be advisable to change the statement on page 20 of the bill, lines 23 and 24, regarding the number of additional beds which are to be provided. If that has been changed, I do not recall it, although we have added to the number authorized by the bill.

Mr. WARREN. It is not intended to state an exact number, but an approximate number; there may be provided 3,000 beds, or the number may not be much in excess of 2,000. The number of beds will be whatever they find it will be possible to provide in view of the conveniences at the various places and the money that we vote.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I quite agree that the language may be construed as the Senator states, but in order to avoid confusion in the interpretation of the provision on the part of the Public Health Service, I should like to suggest the advisability of striking out the reference to the number of beds. Since the committee amendment was prepared we have added other places.

Mr. WARREN. That provision referred to by the Senator was brought in very much as a whereas is put in a resolution—in order to indicate what the Public Health Service believed they could do, and to show upon what basis the committee took up the consideration of certain places and named them in the bill. I do not know that I have any particular objection to striking out the provision so long as we understand, as we do understand, that the intention of the Public Health Service is to reach the number provided for if they can reach it with the money that they have in hand and with due regard to the conveniences at the various places.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I think that we have added quite materially to the number of beds provided under the bill, and it would seem to me that to put the number in the bill now would rather be misleading. My judgment is it would be wise, after the word "building," the last syllable of which is on line 23, page 20, of the bill, to strike out down to and including the word "beds" on line 24. That would eliminate the statement as to the number, but it would still leave authorization for the buildings for hospital purposes. I will leave the matter, however, to the judgment of the chairman of the committee; but it seems to me that it would be advisable to strike out those words.

Mr. WARREN. This whole hospital provision is entirely new, inserted in the bill by the Senate, and will have to go to conference. My opinion is that there will be more trimming done there, but if the Senator insists upon it I will not object to have it remain on account of its going into conference, in order to show the House on what we base this proposed legislation.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Inasmuch as the matter will go to conference, I will not press the suggestion.

Mr. WARREN. If we can not add, at least we can strike out in conference.

Mr. MOSES. I offer an amendment which I have heretofore sent to the desk and had printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, to be known as section 4, as follows:

SEC. 4. That the President of the Senate appoint three Members of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House three Members of the House, who shall constitute a select joint committee to investigate the Harman geographic code system, which has been acquired and adopted for use by the War Department, and to consider whether or not the use of the said system should be extended to and adopted by the other executive departments and administrative branches of the Government; and to appraise the value of said invention or system, or the use thereof to the United States Government, and determine what would be a just compensation for said system, or the use thereof.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator can hardly expect me to allow that amendment to go into the appropriation bill without previous legislation authorizing it. It is legislation and has not been estimated for and is foreign to the purposes of this measure.

Mr. MOSES. It carries no appropriation.

Mr. WARREN. I shall have to make the point of order against the amendment, although if the Senator wishes to say anything I do not desire to cut him off, and will withhold the point of order.

Mr. MOSES. If the Senator intends to make the point of order, very well; it is needless for me to discuss the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on page 89, in line 11, I move to strike out the figures "\$180,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$250,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 89, line 11, in the item for gauging streams and determining the water supply of the United States, it is proposed to strike out "\$180,000" and in lieu thereof to insert "\$250,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this provision, as it now reads, for gauging streams and determining the water supply of the United States, the investigation of underground currents and artesian wells, and the preparation of reports upon the best methods of utilizing the water resources, and so forth, carries an appropriation of \$180,000. I desire to increase this sum to \$250,000; and I will read in that connection a letter from the State geological survey, Nashville, Tenn.:

STATE OF TENNESSEE,  
STATE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY,  
Nashville, January 17, 1921.

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McKELLAR: The development of the potential water powers of Tennessee and the mineral resources of the State depend on an extensive and thorough program of stream gauging followed up by topographic maps.

As you know, the United States Geological Survey has engaged in this work in the different States, and in Tennessee does this work in cooperation with the State geological survey. The Government is at present handicapped by lack of funds to carry on this work. The present appropriation which the United States Geological Survey has for this work is \$180,000 for stream gauging and \$330,000 for topographic mapping. The director asked for an increase of \$120,000 and \$270,000, respectively. These sums were contained in the original sundry civil bill, but the House Appropriation Committee cut out both increases, leaving both sums as they were formerly.

The failure of the House to recommend the amount requested for stream gauging and topographic mapping will be a severe handicap to the development of water powers and mineral deposits of Tennessee if it is not rectified when this bill comes before the Senate. What this work has meant to Tennessee in the past is shown in one instance by the following quotation from a letter recently written by Mr. James W. Rickey, of the Aluminum Co. of America, on November 23, 1920, from his Pittsburgh office:

"It will be quite agreeable to us and I believe it will be advisable for you to state that had it not been for the stream-flow records that have been taken by the Government on the Little Tennessee River and its tributaries since 1898 it is doubtful if our company would have undertaken this pretentious development. It would seem to me that in making this statement you will have an opportunity to bring out very forcibly the beneficial results that have accrued in this particular case and use this as an argument for securing larger Government appropriations for studying the stream flow of the rivers throughout the country. I believe the Engineer Department at large appreciates this, but, unfortunately, we can not make our Congressmen and Senators view the matter in the proper light."

I feel certain that Mr. Rickey is mistaken in his last statement that our Senators and Congressmen do not appreciate this matter in its proper light. In this one instance, that of the Aluminum Co. of America, several millions of dollars have been spent in Tennessee in building one of our great industrial villages at their plant, where aluminum ingots and rolled sheets are now being made in one of the largest plants of its kind in the world.

Any increase over the old appropriation that the Senate can give for this work will mean much to Tennessee in the program for work that has been planned by the United States Geological Survey and the Tennessee geological survey for the coming two years, so as to get more complete data on developing additional water powers within our State.

Very truly, yours,

WILBUR A. NELSON,  
State Geologist.

I will say, further, that in this one instance the information gathered in the course of this stream-gauging work has resulted in this great plant investing down in the eastern part of my State over \$3,000,000. It employs thousands of people. It has all come about through the information given by this stream-gauging work of the Geological Survey; and I want to ask the chairman of the committee if he will not agree to this increase for that purpose.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. It seems to me, if this enterprise has been so very valuable to Tennessee, that that great State ought to bear part of the expense, and that any deficiency in this appropriation might well be made up by an appropriation by the Tennessee Legislature.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Tennessee Legislature has appropriated for this very purpose, and it is cooperating with the Government. Of course, the incident that I speak of is a past incident. The work has already been done. There is no question of that character raised here. It is for the examination of the streams generally throughout the country for the purpose of letting the people know just what they have. The incident that I have related merely suggests what good may come of an appropriation of this kind. The Geological Survey has asked for a larger amount, and I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if he will not agree to this larger sum. The present appropriation for stream gauging is \$180,000. I have introduced an amendment for \$250,000, and I hope the chairman of the committee will accept it.



Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, this is the situation: The estimates will cover the amendment offered, but the estimates all through on all these items for the Geological Survey are more than we have allowed and more than the House has allowed. The House in this case allowed just what was appropriated for the purpose last year. The subject, of course, is one of great interest and has been to me and others; but economy compels us, in my mind, to adhere very closely to the liberal figures the House has given.

I can not, therefore, accept the amendment. If the Senate wants to vote upon it and vote it in or out, I shall abide by its decision.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the Senator if he will not agree that the figures of \$250,000, instead of \$180,000, may go in, and then let the matter be worked out in conference?

Mr. WARREN. I should prefer not to take that course, as there are so many of these other things. I would rather have the Senate express itself on the matter by a vote.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well. Then I ask for a vote on the question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to be inserted after line 12, page 69.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 69, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

*Provided further*, That at the end of 30 days after the passage of this act the authority conferred upon the Secretary of War under section 201 of the transportation act, 1920, to operate for commercial purposes boats, barges, tugs, or other transportation facilities upon the New York State Barge Canal shall cease, and thereafter there shall be no such operation by the Secretary of War or any other agency of the United States. The Secretary of War shall within said 30 days, or as soon thereafter as practicable, dispose of all boats, barges, tugs, and other transportation facilities purchased or constructed for use upon the said canal, giving to proposed purchasers who intend to use the same upon the said canal the first opportunity to buy, and, pending final disposition, the Secretary of War may lease the same for such use. If the Secretary of War and any such proposed purchaser are unable to agree with respect to price and the proposed purchaser is willing to fix a price by arbitration, the Secretary of War shall select one arbitrator, the proposed purchaser one arbitrator, and the two thus chosen shall select a third. The award may be made by a majority of the arbitrators, and when made shall be final.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, this amendment is in exactly the same language as a joint resolution passed by the Senate last May, introduced by my colleague [Mr. WADSWORTH], at whose request I have offered this amendment.

The War Department has been operating barges and tugs on the Mississippi and Black Warrior Rivers and the New York State Barge Canal. The New York State Legislature have petitioned Congress to have the operation of these barges discontinued on the barge canal. They believe that there will be a more effective use of the canal if the barges are operated by private people; and I therefore offer this amendment, affecting as it does only the New York State Barge Canal. It simply discontinues the operation of the Government vessels on that waterway.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I do not know whether the chairman of the committee wants this legislation on this appropriation bill or not; but if he does, I am not willing to consent to it.

I will say to the Senator from New York that, of course, I have no objection to the Senator and his colleague determining for their own State the question as to whether or not they want this barge line operated. I am not going to interfere with that part of it; but when the Senator puts in his amendment a provision that the barges that are being operated on that canal must be sold to people who want to continue to operate them on that canal, narrowing the sale of the barges down to a very few people, and putting such restrictions around the matter that they must go to these particular bidders, I can not consent to that. These barges were built for the benefit of the United States Government; and if we have no further use for them on the canal, if the Senator does not want the Government to operate them on the barge canal in New York, there are plenty of other places where we are building barges now, and I want greater latitude for the director of this service to use those barges where they may be needed. They can be used now on the Warrior River; they can be used on the Mississippi River; and to force the sale of Government property at a sacrifice when there is need for it in other places is something to which I am not willing to consent.

I shall not, however, go into that question until I find out whether the chairman of the committee is going to allow this legislation to go on this bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, of course, this is legislation of a highly legislative character. It could be admitted, if at

all, only because the Senate had passed on it heretofore; but in a matter of legislation of that kind, of course, settling it in the Senate will hardly guarantee its going into a purely appropriation measure. While I may have supported the proposal in the past, and might again support it on the floor in a bill dealing with it directly, I shall have to object to its going into this bill at this time.

I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I have nothing to say upon the point of order. It seems to me, however, having already passed the Senate, that the amendment is in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There seems to be some law at the present time that authorizes the Secretary of War to operate for commercial purposes boats, barges, tugs, or other transportation facilities upon the New York State Barge Canal, and the Chair assumes at other points, too; and this is an amendment to that law. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senate adopted an amendment relating to the increase in the compensation for the Zoological Park police and other employees, and it was accepted before the case was completely put before the Senate. I have in my hand a memorandum furnished me at my request by the Superintendent of the National Zoological Park. It contains a brief discussion of their compensation, and so forth, as compared with other similar employees of the Government. As the matter will be before the conference committee, I ask unanimous consent that it may be incorporated in the RECORD for the information of the conferees.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK.

#### ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR POLICEMEN, KEEPERS, AND GARDENERS.

An increase of \$20 per month for policemen, keepers, and gardeners is asked. This is additional to the regular pay roll as estimated in preceding sheets, and includes the only increases for position and title asked for this year.

At present the sergeant of police receives \$85 per month, and the policemen, keepers, and gardeners \$80 per month each, basic pay.

This increase would amount to:

1 sergeant of police.....	\$240.00
10 policemen, at \$240.....	2,400.00
12 keepers, at \$240.....	5,040.00
2 gardeners, at \$240.....	480.00

Increase per annum..... 8,160.00

It would make the pay of these men per month—

	Present basic.	Increased to—	And bonus.
Sergeant of police.....	\$85.00	\$105.00	\$125.00
Policemen, keepers, and gardeners.....	80.00	100.00	120.00

This is \$1,440 per month, total compensation for private policemen, keepers, and gardeners. The United States park police receive \$1,360 per annum (no bonus), but have an allowance per man of \$89 for uniforms. Our policemen and keepers are required to purchase their uniforms out of their salaries, there being no lump fund for this purpose. This would still leave the Zoological Park policemen at \$9 per annum less than United States park policemen, as it will be difficult for them to provide uniforms, caps, overcoats, and shoes for \$80 per year.

The salaries recommended for these positions by the Reclassification Commission are as follows:

	Per annum.
Sergeant, National Zoological Park police.....	\$1,800
National Zoological Park policemen.....	1,560
Keepers.....	1,440
Gardeners.....	1,500

Late in the session of last spring a special supplementary estimate was submitted to the Congress, at the request of Senator POMERENE, for increases in the pay of park policemen sufficient to bring the salaries up to those paid the United States park police. As now included, this request for increase covers that item but includes further the keepers and gardeners, as we believe these underpaid and overworked men should receive a like increase in compensation. Police, keepers, and gardeners have always received about the same salaries, and it would be unfortunate to raise one class without like increase for the others.

Mr. CALDER. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 158, line 20, strike out "\$525,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$575,000."

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, this is an amendment to the provision in the bill which provides an appropriation for conducting the Naturalization Bureau in the Department of Labor for the next fiscal year. The present appropriation is \$525,000. That is the same as the appropriation of last year.

This office, Mr. President, is self-sustaining. We naturalize citizens in different States, some in the Federal courts and many in the State courts. In New York State 90 per cent of those naturalized are naturalized in the State courts. The

practice is to permit the clerk of the court to retain one-half of the naturalization fees collected up to \$6,000. That is, they may retain one-half of \$6,000, or \$3,000. After that all the fees are turned in to the Department of Labor and then placed in the Treasury of the United States, and the Department of Labor may award to the different clerks of the courts any sum they like out of this appropriation of \$525,000.

Naturalization is increasing every year. The first quarter of the present fiscal year it was 20 per cent greater than in the corresponding quarter of the year before, and really we need a very much larger sum than the amount I have suggested. An estimate was submitted for \$300,000 more than is recommended by the committee. I have asked for only \$50,000 more. I do know we need relief in the large cities of the country, particularly in New York.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, knowing, as I do, the activities and the returns that are made, and this being a rather small portion of the estimate, on the statement of the Senator from New York I have no objection to the amendment offered by him.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk which I offer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 67, line 1, under the item for the Mississippi River, strike out "\$6,670,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000,000," so that the line will read:

Mississippi River, \$10,000,000.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, this is an item to increase the amount of the appropriation for the Mississippi River Commission. That commission, as is probably very well known to the Senate, was created in 1879, and it has been operating on the river since that time. Its original jurisdiction was from the city of Cairo, Ill., to the Head of the Passes.

More recently its jurisdiction was extended to Rock Island, Ill. It now has charge of the river for a distance of some 1,571 miles. Its special duty is to protect, as nearly as possible, the lands adjacent to the Mississippi River from devastating floods, to control the regimen of the river, to prevent the caving of the banks, and, in a general way, to look after that mighty stream, which is the Nation's sewer, as it drains practically one-half of the North American Continent.

The task of controlling the Mississippi River is an immense one, and much success has been had by the Mississippi River Commission in that task. I shall not make a speech in a general way about it. I wish merely to give a little idea of the magnitude of the task involved, to look after that mighty stream for over 1,571 miles, to keep the banks from caving, to look after navigation, to insure a channel of not less than 250 feet wide and 9 feet in depth from Cairo down, to safeguard from overflow something like 29,000 square miles of the best land on this continent.

The States and local communities are obliged to contribute very liberally to the task. The change which I suggest by the amendment is authorized by the flood control act approved March 1, 1917. I hold the act in my hand. The important passage reads as follows:

That for controlling the floods of the Mississippi River and continuing its improvement from the Head of the Passes to the mouth of the Ohio River the Secretary of War is hereby empowered, authorized, and directed to carry on continuously, by hired labor or otherwise, the plans of the Mississippi River Commission heretofore or hereafter adopted, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$45,000,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$10,000,000 shall be expended therefor during any one fiscal year.

The debates and all the evidence in connection with this act show that it was the contemplation of Congress that to do the work effectively the National Government must contribute at the rate of at least \$10,000,000 annually. The act was passed March 1, 1917, and a few days thereafter war was declared by this country; so that every year—

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, I ask for order in the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It seems to be impossible to maintain order this morning.

Mr. RANDELL. I think I can make those hear me, Mr. President, who are willing to hear me, and the others I can not make listen anyhow. So I am entirely satisfied to talk to those who will listen.

I started to say that the act was passed March 1, 1917, contemplating this expenditure of \$10,000,000 per annum. War was declared very shortly thereafter, so that in the appropriation act of that year, instead of giving \$10,000,000 for this work an appropriation of \$6,000,000 was made. The war progressed for some time, and it was extremely difficult to have the work done advantageously on account of high prices and shortage of labor.

The next year an appropriation of \$6,670,000 was made, instead of the \$10,000,000 contemplated. The next year the appropriation was again \$6,670,000, and the fourth year it was \$6,670,000. In other words, since that law was passed we have had four annual appropriations, the first being \$6,000,000 and each of the other three \$6,670,000. There was probably a very good reason for that small appropriation originally, because it was extremely difficult to have the work done. Contractors were loaded up with Government contracts, they were interested in a variety of things, and if larger sums had been appropriated it is probable they would not have been expended.

I shall now refer to the report of the Mississippi River Commission, and I may say to Senators who have not followed this matter that the Mississippi River Commission annually makes a very clear and full report to the Chief of Engineers of the Army, which is published as a part of its annual report. The report sent to Congress last December shows, on page 1969, that on the 1st of July, 1919, the commission had to its credit \$21,942,066, an accumulation for the years of the war, during which time, as I have said, it was almost impossible to expend the money advantageously. It was not spent sooner because it could not be spent wisely.

On the 1st of July of the following year—July 1, 1920, seven months ago—the report shows that the commission had expended and contracted for the expenditure of a total of thirteen million and some hundred thousand dollars, leaving a balance on hand at that date of \$8,091,000.

I trust Senators will follow me in those figures. One year and seven months ago—July 1, 1919—there were over \$21,000,000 on hand. During the next 12 months something over \$13,000,000 was spent. On July 1, 1920, there was a balance of a little over \$8,000,000 on hand to carry on this great work, in which the States and communities were participating. They are obliged to put up \$1 for levee building for every \$2 the National Government puts up. They are also obliged to furnish rights of way and pay for any damages that occur; and in some instances the damages to property are very considerable and the rights of way for the new levees are very costly. So the task of the local people is considerably more than would appear on the face.

With \$8,091,000 to the credit of this work seven months ago, what is the present situation? In order to obtain that information, I wrote to the president of the Mississippi River Commission, Col. Charles L. Potter, and I would like to read the letter he has just written to me, which is not long, dated January 29, 1921. I wrote him and also telegraphed, asking him to give me the present status of expenditures, and to state whether or not his commission really needs the \$10,000,000 provided for in my amendment to the bill. Here is what he said:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION,  
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
St. Louis, Mo., January 29, 1921.

Hon. JOSEPH E. RANDELL,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have your telegram of yesterday asking for information as to the funds needed on the Mississippi River under the pending sundry civil bill.

The improvement of the Mississippi is a big work, and economy demands that it be done as rapidly as funds can be economically and judiciously expended. This may be discussed under two heads:

Firstly, we have a large and very expensive plant—

That plant has been accumulating, Senators, since 1879. It has cost a great deal of money. Col. Potter continues:

With such a plant, economy demands that it be employed as near continuously as possible. Our overhead expense is just as large whether we are expending \$6,670,000 or \$10,000,000 per annum.

Mr. President, I can not hear myself talk. I will wait until the conversation ceases and then go on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has endeavored to keep order this morning, but it seems to be impossible.

Mr. RANDELL. I will wait until the Senators finish talking. I am in no hurry at all; we have plenty of time. When they get through I will start, and not before, Mr. President. I am entitled to a little consideration. I do not often address the Senate, and this is a very important subject.

I would like Senators who are now listening to know that this is not what I say, but what Col. Charles L. Potter, president of the Mississippi River Commission, an eminent engineer of the United States Army, has to say:

Our plant is deteriorating whether employed or unemployed; the interest on the investment and insurance (not tangible, but they must be counted) run on whether the plant is working or idle; and some of the force necessary for operation must be employed to care for the plant while lying idle.

The \$6,670,000 provided in the sundry civil bill of a year ago is now practically all expended or tied up in contracts; our plant will be idle in a very short time; the district engineers are out of funds and asking for more.



Senators, seven months ago there were \$8,091,000 on hand. Nineteen months ago there were \$21,000,000 on hand. It is gone; it has been expended. The commission has practically nothing. The plant will be idle, the president says—and I assure you that your announcement that the sundry civil bill will be taken up in the Senate next week has a joyous sound to us on the river.

Mr. KENYON. The money appropriated in the bill will not be available now in any event.

Mr. RANDELL. I understand it will be.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator understands that it will be available?

Mr. RANDELL. It will be available immediately, as soon as the bill becomes a law. Col. Potter continues:

With funds available at an early date and with the great probability of a low flood this year (enabling us to get ready for the season's work, which should begin unusually early) we will be in excellent shape to do a lot of work, and if we can get \$10,000,000 we can make things fly.

Secondly, we are getting our levee system into shape. As you know, it is largely a question of enlarging existing levee lines. But those levee lines are at many places threatened by caving banks.

I will say to Senators that a great deal of the money has to be expended to build bank revetments to prevent the very expensive levees from caving into the river, and some of this work is to prevent entire towns from caving into the river.

Mr. KENYON. May I ask the Senator whether his amendment makes the money immediately available?

Mr. RANDELL. My understanding is that the construction of the department is that the money is available as soon as appropriated. That is the way the comptroller has been ruling.

Mr. KENYON. I do not see how that can be the case under the law. On page 66 of the bill the money is said to be appropriated in accordance with the provisions of the flood-control act approved March 1, 1917.

Mr. RANDELL. The provisions of the act make it available as soon as appropriated, as I understand it. If there be any doubt about it, I would like to have that cleared up, because whatever amount is appropriated ought to be available at once.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that it is available at once under the flood-control act. All appropriations made under that act are immediately available, and therefore this appropriation would be immediately available.

Mr. RANDELL. That is my understanding of it. I thank the Senator from Utah for his explanation. It is certainly imperative that whatever they get should be immediately available, as they are out of money now. Col. Potter continues:

As you know, it is largely a question of enlarging existing levee lines. But those levee lines are at many places threatened by caving banks. Our funds are not sufficient to do all the bank work necessary to protect them. A sudden development in caving may threaten the line to such an extent that we have to throw the levee back, not having funds to protect it by bank revetment. We can protect only the most important levees, where it would be necessary to throw the line far back if the front line were carried away. Your own Lake Providence revetment is a good illustration. Had the Mississippi River broken into Lake Providence, as it undoubtedly would had we not held the bank, your levee line would now be along the south side of the lake and across to Pilchers Point, throwing out all of the Wilsons Point territory and having a bad effect on the regimen of the river from Pilchers Point to Lake Providence and below.

I will say to the Senate that Lake Providence was safeguarded many years ago by a revetment which has held perfectly and the town is well protected now, as are others on the river. Had that revetment not been put in, the entire town would have gone into the river and been destroyed, and something like 25 very valuable plantations would have also been thrown out and completely destroyed.

Every revetment we can put in to protect the existing levee line saves that much more levee and reduces the yardage necessary to complete the levee system. If we had the funds to revet these banks (and they will finally have to be revetted after we have possibly lost two or three levee lines), many of these expensive relocations could be avoided; we would soon complete the levee line, and in the end we would save a lot of money.

We now, six months after we were able to get to work last year, are practically out of funds; we have excellent opportunity to get ready for this season's work; we have little or no prospect of a flood, and should get to work very early; but if we get only the \$6,670,000 this year I fear we shall be forced to shut down early next fall and lose a great part of the best working season—plant idle, force disorganized and scattered.

We are earnestly hoping that you can get \$10,000,000, and get it early. If you do, and we have no adverse conditions, we will show you that we can expend it judiciously, can do good and necessary work with it, and in the end it will result in great economy.

Very respectfully,

CHAS. L. POTTER,  
Colonel, Corps of Engineers, United States Army,  
President Mississippi River Commission.

The sum of \$10,000,000 was recommended by the Mississippi River Commission and approved by the Chief of Engineers. So it is before us with the approval of the authorities designated to examine such matters and approve or disapprove. The

report of the Engineers shows that they had on hand, as I said twice before, quite a large sum 19 months ago, and they spent or had under contract over \$13,000,000 during the following 12 months. In the last seven months they have spent the balance on hand of about \$8,000,000, and now they are practically out of funds. It is a great work, a most expensive one, and certainly the commission ought to be given the money to carry it on.

Mr. KENYON. What is the balance on hand now?

Mr. RANDELL. Col. Potter says there is practically nothing on hand.

Mr. KENYON. How much is it? "Practically nothing" is rather an elastic term.

Mr. RANDELL. I can only give you what the letter of the president of the commission says. Their report shows that July 1, 1920, the balance available was \$8,091,119. Col. Potter writes me on the 29th day of January as follows:

The \$6,670,000 provided in the sundry civil bill of a year ago—

Which is a part of that \$8,000,000, I would say—

is now practically all expended or tied up in contracts. Our plant will be idle in a very short time. The district engineers are out of funds and asking for more.

I will say to the Senator that this money is expended by district engineers located at New Orleans, La., Vicksburg, Miss., and Memphis, Tenn. There are four districts on the river from St. Louis down. The first and second districts extend some little distance below Memphis. They are under one engineer. The third district goes from there down a little below the city of Vicksburg, and the fourth district from there to New Orleans. These district engineers are out of funds. I had a letter from my brother, Judge F. X. Ransdell, several days ago, written from Providence, saying that he had been to the upper end of East Carroll Parish where the commission was doing some splendid work with a wonderful dirt-moving machine, moving the earth very inexpensively; that the machine was idle, and they did not have money to carry the work on. That is testimony entirely independent of Col. Potter, who says they are out of funds, that the money has been expended, and that they are very anxious to get more funds.

Mr. KENYON. I am not asking my question in a controversial spirit.

Mr. RANDELL. I understand the spirit in which the Senator is asking the question.

Mr. KENYON. Can the Senator tell us about the contracts, or the amount of money covered by contracts outstanding?

Mr. RANDELL. I will explain that as best I can to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. And also how busy will the contracts keep the force?

Mr. RANDELL. The levee work is done in two ways. It is let out by contract at so much per yard to men who have their own levee or dirt-moving outfits. In some instances that outfit is composed of mules and wheel scrapers; in other instances of big dirt-moving machines. Those machines are very powerful. They have a great cable running from the machine, which is located on the land side of the levee, 400, 500, 600, and as much as 800 feet out toward the river bank. A great bucket drops down from the cable, takes up from 5 to 9 cubic yards of earth, is then pulled in by another cable held up over the levee, and the contents are dropped down at the point desired. Those machines cost \$140,000 to \$150,000. They are a great development and improvement over the old method. They can work where the mule teams can not stand up, where it is entirely too wet to work by teams. They can cross wet, boggy places where the teams can not go. They can work 24 hours a day, if necessary, and it is not practical to work mules more than 9 or 10 hours.

Contracts have been let to some of these contracting firms, but in no instance, as I understand it, do the contracts run beyond the working season. They are practically all completed now. The commission does not give continuing contracts running for two or three years, as is done in the excavation of rocks and very difficult material in the ordinary river and harbor work. The Mississippi River Commission has never adopted the plan of making continuing contracts. They always worked from one season to another season, using up all available funds during the current fiscal year. From all the information I have, these contracts are practically completed. Just how much may remain still to be done on them and for which the money is held, I can not say. The letter to which I have referred shows that it is practically all expended, and certainly in my own locality, where the work is being done by wages, with big machines which move the dirt very cheaply, there is practically no money left.

Just a word or two more. I do not wish to tire the Senate. I can not conceive of a much more important work to a very great portion of our Nation than this, extending as it does from Rock Island, Ill., to the Gulf of Mexico, 1,571 miles. I can not conceive, Mr. President and Senators, if we are going to do that work, why we ought not to make sufficient appropriation to carry it along in a businesslike manner. There is a very extensive plant which I have tried to describe.

The States and localities, under the law to which I have referred, contribute very liberally. They are ready to contribute and anxious to put up their part. The money can not be spent by the Government unless the States put up their part also. It is a cooperative proposition, so why not carry it along in the manner contemplated by the flood control act? We will have to do it some time. It would certainly save very much if we could be allowed to carry it along in a businesslike, systematic manner. I earnestly hope that the Senate will agree to the amendment which I have proposed.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, it seems to me, if the amendment is to be agreed to, and if we are now to appropriate the full amount provided for in the flood control act, it will practically be noted by the Senate to the Commerce Committee that a policy is to be pursued different from that which Congress has adopted, and which I think it did intend to follow this year, of cutting down all appropriations except those that are absolutely necessary, which means that many projects which have been adopted and are very important, will be cut out. This amendment, if adopted, is going to mean an increase not only of \$4,000,000, but an additional appropriation of \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000, because, considering the state of the Treasury, the appropriation of \$6,670,000 for the Mississippi River is very much more liberal than any other appropriation made by Congress under like circumstances. The limitation in the original flood control act was \$10,000,000 per year. No one then dreamed that the Treasury would be in such a condition as it now is. If Congress is going to economize at all, the pending amendment ought not to be adopted, because the appropriation in the bill of \$6,670,000 is very liberal indeed for this purpose.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, not very long ago I was walking on the levee which protects the city of Caruthersville. There are many thousand acres of adjacent farm property. On the left of that levee, still visible, were the remnants of another levee that had been built and destroyed. On the right of the existing levee a great new levee was being hastily constructed—it being the third levee—to protect that place. That levee was made necessary, why? Because the revetment work a little farther up on the Mississippi River, which would have protected the situation and entirely obviated the necessity of the new levee, had for lack of funds been allowed to go unfinished.

It costs \$10,000,000 annually to keep the flood-control work in operation on the Mississippi River, with its more than 1,500 miles of length. The greatest extravagance in regard to the operation of the inland waterways system of which I can think is to appropriate an inadequate amount for the control of the banks of the Mississippi River.

I had a friend who made a loan upon a farm of 160 acres near where the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers come together. When the three-year period of the mortgage was up and it was time to renew the loan, the farmer who owned that farm made no objection to the terms of renewal; so my friend's suspicions were somewhat aroused, and he went to look at the 160-acre farm upon which three years before he had made the loan. When he got there he, of course, found that the farm had been acquired by some one who was not a resident of Missouri; that the 160-acre farm had disappeared; that all that was left was a part of the barn and about 100 square feet of land. Why was that? It was because the revetment work upon the river, which this appropriation is intended to safeguard, was allowed to remain unfinished.

One might as well try to economize by buying 2 yards of material with which to make a suit of clothes for a big man as to attempt to make an inadequate appropriation for the flood control of the Mississippi River. We have been fooling with the matter for years. We make a small appropriation; that is exhausted, and the work is destroyed by the next flood. If for three years we would continue the appropriation of \$10,000,000 annually, which was in the contemplation of Congress when the flood control act was passed in 1917, the whole problem would be solved. I very much hope that we may now commence upon a program which will adequately take care of the flood-control problem on the Mississippi River.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SPENCER. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator does not mean to say that an appropriation of \$6,670,000 is not a substantial appropriation, does he?

Mr. SPENCER. It is a very large sum of money, but it is absolutely inadequate to conduct the flood-control work on the Mississippi River.

Mr. LENROOT. It will require several years—

Mr. SPENCER. If I may answer the Senator from Wisconsin further, I ask into whose hands have we put this matter? We have put it into the hands of trusted engineers whose life work it is. They come to the Senator from Wisconsin and to me, neither of whom knows the details of the work, and they say: "Here is the problem: We can not manage it without an appropriation of \$10,000,000 a year." The Senator from Wisconsin replies: "Is not \$6,670,000 a large appropriation?" The engineers say: "It is; but it is inadequate for the work that is to be done." That is the whole problem.

Mr. LENROOT. It does not require any expert knowledge to understand where there is a limitation of \$10,000,000 a year in a law providing for a certain purpose that \$5,000,000 a year can be utilized for doing half of the work. That is merely common sense.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, this whole matter was thrashed out in Congress in 1917, when the flood-control legislation was under consideration. Congress, after very full consideration of the question, passed the flood control act. That act, in the interest of the general welfare, provided for the expenditure of \$10,000,000 a year for flood control on the Mississippi River.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Mississippi must be familiar with the law; and his statement is not correct. The law does not say that \$10,000,000 shall be spent, but that not more than \$10,000,000 shall be spent in any one year.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, the Senator from Wisconsin is grabbing at a straw; but Congress authorized the expenditure of \$10,000,000 a year.

Mr. LENROOT. No; the sum of \$45,000,000 was authorized to be expended, and then a limitation was made that not more than \$10,000,000 shall be spent in any one year.

Mr. HARRISON. But it was the judgment of Congress that that was the reasonable amount to be expended each year to carry on this improvement and to protect the people along the river from floods.

Mr. LENROOT. It was the judgment of Congress that not more than that amount should be expended in any one year.

Mr. HARRISON. Absolutely; and if the judgment of Congress had been that it should have been \$6,670,000 a year they would have provided that not more than \$6,670,000 a year should have been expended; in their wisdom they placed in the law the provision that \$45,000,000 could be expended, but not more than \$10,000,000 in any one year, taking it for granted that future Congresses would appropriate \$10,000,000, and indicating that, in their judgment, it would be wise to expend not more than that amount every year. So, after that fight had been made, we believed that each year the Congress would appropriate \$10,000,000 to carry on this great work. It seems to me, under the present conditions, it would be a very unwise policy for Congress to cut this appropriation below \$10,000,000.

Since 1917, when the act was passed, we have had to face in this country peculiar and unprecedented conditions. Materials have been high; labor has been high; we all know the conditions which have arisen; and the committees of Congress, both in the House and in the Senate, cut the amount below \$10,000,000 to the amount of \$6,670,000 because of those peculiar war conditions that confronted the country.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the Senator think that the financial condition of the country is better to-day than it has been during any year since 1917?

Mr. HARRISON. I know that the Senator from Wisconsin would 20 years from now use the same argument in the effort to cut down this appropriation that he is now using and that he used in 1917 against the bill and in 1918 to reduce the appropriation. So I presume that it would be a forlorn hope upon my part to attempt to convince the Senator that there ought to be a larger appropriation.

That the amount of \$20,000,000 referred to by the Senator from Louisiana had accumulated in July, 1917, was due to the fact that the men who composed the commission were wise



economists, and because of the high cost of material and the high cost of labor did not expend the money during those years, and so it accumulated; but the work was not done, the improvements were not made, and the people living along the banks of the Mississippi River were not protected from flood.

It seems to me that if there is ever to be a time when Congress should begin to appropriate to carry out its promise that was written in the act of 1917, namely, to appropriate for five years not over \$10,000,000—and I repeat that that act carried a promise that the Congress was going to appropriate \$10,000,000 for those years—now is a good time to begin this work. If the reports which have come to those of us who are interested in this matter are correct not only should the representatives in the Senate and House of those who live along the banks of the Mississippi be interested in this matter but the whole country should be interested in it. The Senator from Pennsylvania and the people from Pennsylvania should be interested, because if the Mississippi River is improved and its channel is deepened so that commerce may flow on it, it will help the people in the vicinity of Pittsburgh, Pa., in Ohio, in Indiana, in Kentucky, and elsewhere throughout the United States to get their products to the sea. So at this time, when some people are so anxious to appropriate large sums for and to vote for legislation to aid the common carriers of the country, to increase the freight rates of the American people, to charge higher rates for passenger fares, and practically to guarantee certain amounts to the railroads, it seems to me that we should at least be wise enough and generous enough to make appropriations for river and harbor improvements that will enable the waterways of the country to meet the railroads in competition and give the people cheaper freight rates. Unless sufficient appropriations are made money which is spent oftentimes does not do any good. For instance, let me read from a report of one of the engineers. He says:

The total cost of the levee retirement this year at Riverton—

One of the places along the river—

including cost of right of way, will be more than \$200,000. The amount of needed revetment is not reduced by that retirement.

In other words, we are placed in the attitude of spending \$200,000 to retire the levee at that place, when, if they had the necessary funds, they could put in revetment and save that much money. There is no economy in expending several hundred thousand dollars to retire the levee, for it will be necessary to provide revetment work in the course of time. So the Congress should spend the money that it promised in the act of 1917 to appropriate for carrying on revetment work and other improvements to protect the people living along that river and also aid in navigation.

This is only one case. The total cost of the levee retirement, this engineer says, this year at Cottonwood will be about \$137,000. The amount of the needed revetment is not reduced by the retirement.

In other words, the policy that has been pursued of not appropriating a sufficient amount of money makes it necessary for them to expend \$137,000 at that place for retirement, when, if they had the money in hand, they could use it for revetment work and save that amount of money to the taxpayers of the country.

It is not necessary for me to say—I could cite other cases—that all of this money comes out of the Federal Treasury. The people of my State alone along the Mississippi River have taxed themselves to the amount of approximately \$100,000,000 for holding back the flood waters of the Mississippi and protecting themselves from overflow and destruction, and the same thing is true in Arkansas and Louisiana and in other States along the river. Under the act of 1917, wherein you promised that you would appropriate year by year to the amount of \$45,000,000, at the rate of not more than \$10,000,000 a year, you held out to them the hope that you were going to do it, and in that very law you said that for every two dollars that the Government should put up the people along the protected area should put up a dollar. Why, last year in my State alone, in the Delta of Mississippi, they put up \$1,000,000 and the Federal Government expended only \$500,000.

Mr. McCORMICK. That is fair.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, yes; the Senator says it is fair. We had to do it, because the raging waters were coming down from the north, and they would have left destruction in their wake if we had not expended the million dollars when the Federal Government expended only \$500,000; but the promise of Congress was to do differently from what the Senator from Illinois says is fair. They said that for every million dollars the Federal Government put up the States or the localities along the border need put up only \$500,000; but we turned it around this last year. We had to do it; and that has been the case for years.

This is a great national problem. It is urgent. It is necessary. It will enable better contracts to be made. It will enable this work to progress that has been hampered for years; and it seems to me, therefore, that the appropriation of \$10,000,000 that was held out to us as a hope when the Congress, after full consideration of the question, said that it would be a reasonable amount to be appropriated every year, should be agreed to by the committee and by the Senate at this time.

I sincerely hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will prevail.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I want to say merely a word in connection with my remarks that the expenditure of \$2 by the State for this purpose to \$1 by the Federal Treasury was fair.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a correction? I said that the Federal Government on the levee building now was expending \$2 and the State \$1. I simply wish to be correct in that respect.

Mr. McCORMICK. I merely wanted to make the point that if the States were required always to expend \$2 to the Federal Government's expenditure of \$1, whether for the pavement of rivers or the pavement of highways, it would be better.

Mr. HARRISON. That may be all right as a general proposition; but I know the Senator is a very just Senator, and gives these matters great consideration, and I know he does not want to make an assertion like that without full deliberation. When it comes down to a great problem like the Mississippi River, the waters of which flow from Pennsylvania, Ohio, and from the States of the Far West, does the Senator think that after the people, not of the whole State of Mississippi, I might say—I am just applying it to my State, but the same thing applies to other States—are taxed to put up these \$2, as they did last year, for \$1 upon the part of the Federal Government—it is applied just to that levee district that is included in the flood district, not the whole State—does the Senator think that in that instance it is not fair for the Federal Government to put up \$2 to that locality's \$1, especially after, in the case of the Delta of the Mississippi, they have expended \$100,000,000 already in this work?

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator from Mississippi did not speak of the levee district a moment ago.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, it applies just to the levee district. They tax cotton and everything else they raise in order to raise taxes for this expenditure in that particular locality; and the question of whether it should be two to one upon the part of the Federal Government was all settled by Congress in 1917 in the flood control act. So I take it that the Congress ought to live up to its promises as enumerated in that act.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, we have years of plenty and years of famine, as of old. I think that at the present time we are in the twilight between the sunshine of prosperity and, if not famine, certainly tighter times. We know the stringency of funds and the falling off of receipts from taxation. I hope this amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, the chief of the board of engineers of the State of Louisiana states that the appropriation of \$10,000,000 a year on the part of the Government was at the time conceded under normal conditions to be imperative to enable the flood control act to function effectively, yet the amounts so far provided by the Government have never approximated that figure, though the conditions under which operations were carried on were burdened and handicapped by abnormal conditions of the most aggravated character and type. Ten million dollars a year under normal conditions thus became equivalent to only about \$5,000,000 at best under abnormal conditions, thus providing for the execution of not more than one-half of the estimates of the engineers.

I want to say that during the past year we have had a low river—the Mississippi River has not reached the stage that usually prevails at this time of the year. The great levee machines which have been so well described by my colleague have been able to continue working, and every effort has been made to bring the levees up to the grade and section required by the commission.

The Mississippi River Commission reports that 76 per cent of this work is now complete, and that it is important to rush the work to completion, and that with the wonderful season we have had, the good weather, the early spring, these machines could continue, and that if they could get the money now it would be a matter of economy, instead of prolonging this work and possibly stopping it by reason of the lack of funds.

The statement was made here on the floor of the Senate that the commission was practically out of funds. I tried to get the exact figures from the Chief of Engineers only a few minutes ago. They have not the exact figures in the report from the

commission. I am told, however, that on the 1st of January very little was available, and that they must have this money at this time in order to continue the work. It would be a disaster if they should have to stop it, particularly when the work is so near completion, and I sincerely hope the Senate will see fit to adopt the amendment for \$10,000,000.

## COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTE.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the hour is approaching when it will be necessary for the Senate to proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives to take part in the announcement of the electoral vote. I therefore make the point of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gronna	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Hale	McCumber	Smith, Ga.
Brandegge	Harris	McKellar	Smith, S. C.
Calder	Harrison	McNary	Smoot
Capper	Heflin	Moses	Spencer
Colt	Henderson	Myers	Sterling
Culberson	Hitchcock	Nelson	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Swanson
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Thomas
Dillingham	Kellogg	Pittman	Trammell
Elkins	Kendrick	Polindexter	Underwood
Fletcher	Kenyon	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Gay	Keyes	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Glass	King	Robinson	Warren
Gooding	Kirby	Sheppard	Williams
Gore	Lenroot	Simmons	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Senators, under the order of the Senate adopted in pursuance of the concurrent resolution providing for the counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States, the Senate will now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives. At the conclusion of the joint session, the Senate will return to its Chamber, whereupon the report of the tellers will be made to the Senate, and the Senate will resume its regular business. This is not an adjournment.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate, preceded by the Vice President, the Secretary, and the Sergeant at Arms, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of participating in the count of the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States.

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m., and the Vice President resumed the chair.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in accordance with law, and on behalf of the tellers of the electoral vote on the part of the Senate, I offer the report which I send to the desk, which I ask to be read and printed in the Journal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The reading clerk read as follows:

"The undersigned, HENRY CABOT LODGE and OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, tellers on the part of the Senate, and FLORIAN LAMPERT and WILLIAM W. RUCKER, tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States for the term beginning on the 4th day of March, 1921:

Electoral votes of each State.	States.	For President.		For Vice President.	
		Warren G. Harding, of Ohio.	James M. Cox, of Ohio.	Calvin Coolidge, of Massachusetts.	Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York.
12	Alabama.....		12		12
3	Arizona.....	3		3	
9	Arkansas.....		9		9
13	California.....	13		13	
6	Colorado.....	6		6	
7	Connecticut.....	7		7	
3	Delaware.....	3		3	
6	Florida.....		6		6
14	Georgia.....		14		14
4	Idaho.....	4		4	
29	Illinois.....	29		29	
15	Indiana.....	15		15	
13	Iowa.....	13		13	
10	Kansas.....	10		10	
13	Kentucky.....		13		13
10	Louisiana.....		10		10
6	Maine.....		6		6
8	Maryland.....	8		8	
18	Massachusetts.....	18		18	
12	Michigan.....	12		12	
10	Minnesota.....		10		10
18	Mississippi.....	18		18	
4	Montana.....	4		4	
8	Nebraska.....	8		8	
3	Nevada.....	3		3	

Electoral votes of each State.	States.	For President.		For Vice President.	
		Warren G. Harding, of Ohio.	James M. Cox, of Ohio.	Calvin Coolidge, of Massachusetts.	Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York.
4	New Hampshire.....	4		4	
14	New Jersey.....	14		14	
3	New Mexico.....	3		3	
45	New York.....	45		45	
12	North Carolina.....		12		12
5	North Dakota.....	5		5	
24	Ohio.....	24		24	
10	Oklahoma.....	10		10	
5	Oregon.....	5		5	
38	Pennsylvania.....	38		38	
5	Rhode Island.....	5		5	
9	South Carolina.....		9		9
5	South Dakota.....	5		5	
12	Tennessee.....	12		12	
20	Texas.....		20		20
4	Utah.....	4		4	
4	Vermont.....	4		4	
12	Virginia.....		12		12
7	Washington.....	7		7	
8	West Virginia.....	8		8	
13	Wisconsin.....	13		13	
3	Wyoming.....	3		3	
531		404	127	404	127

"HENRY CABOT LODGE,  
"OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,  
"Tellers on the part of the Senate.

"FLORIAN LAMPERT,  
"W. W. RUCKER,  
"Tellers on the part of the House of Representatives.

"The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

"The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

"Warren G. Harding, of the State of Ohio, has received for President of the United States 404 votes;

"James M. Cox, of the State of Ohio, has received 127 votes.

"The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

"The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

"Calvin Coolidge, of the State of Massachusetts, has received for Vice President of the United States 404 votes;

"Franklin D. Roosevelt, of the State of New York, has received 127 votes.

"This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the 4th day of March, 1921, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives."

## COLD-STORAGE FOODS—CONFERENCE REPORT (S. DOC. NO. 377).

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the so-called cold-storage bill, being the bill (H. R. 9521) to prevent hoarding and deterioration of, and deception with respect to, cold-storage foods, to regulate shipments of cold-storage foods in interstate commerce, and for other purposes. The bill has been in conference for almost one year. I ask that the report be printed and lie upon the table. I shall hope to call it up just as soon as the sundry civil appropriation bill has been disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15422) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], which will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 67, line 1, strike out "\$6,670,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000,000," so as to read:

Mississippi River, \$10,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have only a word to say about the pending amendment. I am very much in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana proposing to increase the sum to be used this year for levees. The State of Tennessee is not interested in the building of levees along the Mississippi River in one sense; that is, no levees are built in our



State. I believe a very short, 5 or 6 mile, levee has been built in the extreme northern end of the State, a Kentucky levee, built just over the Tennessee line a few miles. But living in Memphis, the head of the levee districts of the Mississippi River, I am for this amendment.

Congress has already provided by law that this work shall be completed, and it is just a question as to when and how soon it shall be done. It seems to me it would be most economical to go ahead and finish the work. It is most necessary for the safety of the levees themselves already built, as well as persons or property now protected by them, that the levees be completed. That it is an important national question can not be gainsaid. There are 29 States drained by that great river. The Nation has recognized it as a national proposition, and provided for it by national law, and directed that it should be completed as soon as possible, and it does seem to me that we ought to appropriate the money so that it can be done not only as expeditiously as possible, but as economically as possible; and it has been demonstrated, in my judgment, that it could be more economically done if done at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. President, these great levees are absolutely necessary to the safety of the people of the great valley of the Mississippi River. The waters of perhaps one-third of the territory of the United States pass through this great basin on their way to the Gulf. It is not right that the people of the valley should alone be made to defend themselves against the surplus or flood waters from other States. The Congress has already decided this question. Let us stand by that decision.

For these reasons, it seems to me, this amendment ought to be agreed to, and we should go ahead and finish the work. Therefore I am going to vote for the amendment, and I hope that our friends on the other side will permit it to be enacted into law.

Mr. GAY. At the time the Senate recessed to attend the joint meeting of the Senate and the House to count the votes for President and Vice President, I had made a statement in regard to the pending amendment. Since that time I have received the figures, in answer to the question of one Senator, as to the amount of money on hand for this work.

On December 31 last the Mississippi River Commission had on hand \$5,876,000, of which \$3,528,000 was under contract, leaving \$2,350,000. During the month of December, 1920, there was expended \$1,468,000. It can readily be seen that this money can not hold out very long, if they are able to continue the work, which they are able to do, due to the splendid season they have had.

In commenting further upon this matter, I refer again to the letter of the chief engineer of the State of Louisiana, in which he said:

"To control these waters and pass them safely and harmlessly past our doors to the sea has been a battle of centuries, only just about to be won, if our ammunition, the sinews of war—appropriations—only holds out.

"In no other struggle against annihilation would our country hesitate, no matter what the cost.

"Why should it do so in this instance, where the cause is so just and so much may be gained at comparatively so little outlay?"

Mr. President, this work can be completed in a short time if the commission can go ahead with the work, but if we, through a misapprehension of economy, fail to give the necessary amount to keep the great levee machines and these contracts going, we will imperil that great part of the country, the Mississippi Valley, and we will delay the work at a time when great work can be accomplished.

We need \$10,000,000 now. The law as originally passed contemplated that amount. Adopt this amendment and let the work go forward as rapidly as possible.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. GAY. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. According to the figures read by the Senator, if this amendment were adopted the money could not be expended during the next year. Is not that true?

Mr. GAY. No; I do not agree with the Senator at all. I understand it is available at this time.

Mr. LENROOT. It is available, but the law provides that not more than \$10,000,000 can be expended in any one year.

Mr. GAY. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Therefore not more than \$10,000,000 could be expended the next year if this amendment were adopted, and there are \$5,000,000 unexpended.

Mr. GAY. The Senator from Wisconsin is mistaken. There is only a little over \$2,000,000 unexpended, and the point is, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin, that they could continue to work, and there would be no delay. It is important that this work should be done at a time when it can be done economically. Much of the year they can not work at all, due to high water.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator does not get my point. The law prohibits the expenditure of more than \$10,000,000 this year, even though a larger amount is appropriated.

Mr. GAY. I will say to the Senator that the law, as I understand it, provides that no more than \$10,000,000 shall be appropriated in any one year. If they have money left over from the year previous, it would not interfere with their spending it.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator is mistaken. The law reads that not more than \$10,000,000 shall be expended during any one fiscal year.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, may I be permitted by my colleague to make further explanation?

Mr. GAY. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. RANDELL. I have the law in my hand, and the Senator from Wisconsin is correct. It says:

*Provided*, That not more than \$10,000,000 shall be expended therefor during any one fiscal year.

That is, not more than ten million of the forty-five million. I call the Senator's attention to the fact, from the report of the Chief of Engineers, page 1969, that in that sum which they were expending there was \$1,531,000 contributed for the control of levees by the local people, and that amount is to be taken into consideration in considering the balance on hand of \$8,000,000 on the 1st of July last.

I further call the Senator's attention to the fact that if we give them ten million now, as desired, and add that ten million to the eight million that was on hand the 1st of last July, it would carry them for two full years, and it would be only eighteen million in the two full years, and that would be a strict compliance with the law. It would be within the law.

They have to get ready for this work. It takes time. They have to advertise; they have to let contracts; and while they begin to spend it right away, there will not be much of it spent before the 1st of July. We have to move dirt when it is very dry. There is absolutely no conflict with the law.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, there is no conflict with the law, but the admission now is made that not more than \$10,000,000 could be expended during the next fiscal year.

Mr. RANDELL. And I say there will not be.

Mr. LENROOT. Therefore, not more than \$2,000,000 could be expended between now and the 1st of July under the law. So it is very clear that even though this money is appropriated, it could not be utilized within the next 12 months.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, the Senator seems to ignore entirely that a large amount of the money on hand is from private sources. I ask for a vote, Mr. President, if there is no further debate to be had.

Mr. WARREN. This is such an important matter, Mr. President, that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LENROOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Lodge	Smoot
Ball	Hale	McCormick	Spencer
Beckham	Harris	McCumber	Stanley
Borah	Harrison	McKellar	Sterling
Calder	Heflin	McNary	Sutherland
Capper	Hitchcock	Moses	Thomas
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Trammell
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	New	Underwood
Dial	Kellogg	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Kendrick	Poindexter	Warren
Elkins	Kenyon	Pomeroy	Williams
Fernald	Keyes	Ransdell	Willis
Fletcher	King	Robinson	Wolcott
France	Kirby	Sheppard	
Gay	Knox	Simmons	
Glass	Lenroot	Smith, S. C.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I merely desire to say before we take the vote, because there may have been some Senators who have entered the Chamber who were not here when the discussion was on, if the proposed increase in the appropriation is granted, we are merely carrying out what the Congress said they would do in the act of 1917. A flood or overflow is liable to come at any time, especially in the season just approaching, and the damage that might be done to property along the Mississippi River would be ten times, perhaps, as much as any appropriation that we might make here.

The proposed amendment is in the interest of economy. It is what the Congress should do. It is in the interest of the improvement of navigation and for the protection of property and security of human life along the Mississippi River. Congress should give us the increase that is asked for in the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSELL].

The VICE PRESIDENT. On agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSELL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] has requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIAL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS]. He is absent, and I therefore withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. KIRBY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and vote "yea."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], I withhold my vote.

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I have already voted, but I am compelled to withdraw my vote, as the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], with whom I have a pair, is not present.

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. FERNALD. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] to the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] and vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Since making my previous announcement, I have learned that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], being a member of the committee, would vote in the negative on this question. I am therefore at liberty to vote, and I let my vote stand.

Mr. DIAL. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]; and

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS].

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 30, as follows:

## YEAS—30.

Asbust	Harrison	Robinson	Swanson
Beckham	Heflin	Sheppard	Trammell
Culberson	Henderson	Simmons	Underwood
Dial	Kirby	Smith, S. C.	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	McKellar	Spencer	Williams
Fletcher	Overman	Stanley	Wolcott
Gay	Pittman	Sterling	
Harris	Ransdell	Sutherland	

## NAYS—30.

Ball	Calder	Dillingham	Gronna
Borah	Capper	Fernald	Hale
Brandagee	Curtis	France	Jones, N. Mex.

Jones, Wash.  
Kellogg  
Kenyon  
Keyes  
King

La Follette  
Lenroot  
Lodge  
McCormick  
McCumber

Moses  
Nelson  
New  
Poindexter  
Smoot

Thomas  
Warren  
Willis

## NOT VOTING—36.

Chamberlain  
Colt  
Cummings  
Edge  
Fall  
Frelinghuysen  
Gerry  
Glass  
Gooding

Gore  
Hitchcock  
Johnson, Calif.  
Johnson, S. Dak.  
Kendrick  
Knox  
McLean  
McNary  
Myers

Newberry  
Norris  
Owen  
Page  
Penrose  
Phelan  
Phipps  
Pomerene  
Reed

Sherman  
Shields  
Smith, Ariz.  
Smith, Ga.  
Smith, Md.  
Townsend  
Wadsworth  
Walsh, Mont.  
Watson

So Mr. RANSELL's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, last week I presented an amendment to the item providing for the care and maintenance of sick and disabled soldiers, proposing to increase the amount from \$33,000,000 to \$50,000,000. I was prompted to do that after discussion of the subject with the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and with the national commander of the American Legion. I found them quite disturbed over the fact that, while there is a great increase in the number of disabled service men, apparently the item had been decreased from something like \$46,000,000 to \$33,000,000.

I know that no one is more deeply concerned in the welfare of the ex-service men than are the members of the Committee on Appropriations. I should like to inquire of the chairman of that committee if this particular item has had due consideration and whether they took into consideration the fact that there will be almost 30,000 disabled service men by the time the new fiscal year begins?

Mr. WARREN. I wish in answer to say to the Senator that we are now voting upon a measure which does not take effect until the 1st of July, and which runs then through the fiscal year. There is no disposition to limit the amount of money necessary, as it is found necessary. When we had before us the very able executive officer who has charge of those matters he said that the amount did not matter so much as that he should know that he was being upheld in what he has been doing; that is, that we should appropriate what we know is only the minimum that he will use, and then in deficiencies provide fully for all the balance needed.

As the Senator knows, we shall be in session all summer, and I promise, so far as I am concerned, that long before the exhaustion of this fund, when the necessity appears, I shall join him and others in seeing that there shall be a sufficient amount appropriated.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the Senator from Wyoming I shall not at this time press the amendment to which I have referred; but while we have under consideration the measure which makes appropriations for the care and maintenance of the disabled ex-service men, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a very important statement which appeared in a recent issue of the American Legion Weekly, based on a very complete investigation which was made by the national officers of the American Legion as to the situation with respect to the probable great increase of disabled ex-service men who will require hospital treatment. This article, which appeared a few days ago under the title of "The unfinished battle," gives the following summary of the situation with reference to the disabled veterans:

America has designed intricate Government machinery for caring for her disabled, has appropriated many millions of dollars for their care and comfort, has set thousands of administrators, doctors, and nurses to the task of their restoration and reconstruction. Yet for all that America is in grave danger of being likened to an army that marches on and does not pay sufficient or adequate heed to its disabled. Very few Americans realize what a prodigious problem the disabled man presents. There are 641,000 men who put on the American uniform during the World War whose discharges from the service show various degrees of disability and who are likely, under laws that now stand, to knock at the Government's door any day and ask for hospital treatment, compensation, or vocational training—one or more of the three. Of this number, 268,802 have already been adjudged 10 per cent or more disabled and entitled to compensation from the Government. More than 125,000 of these, with 10 per cent or more disability, have been declared vocationally handicapped, and 60,000 of them are taking vocational training from the Government.

Altogether more than half a million men have claimed compensation on grounds of disability, and of these, one hundred and sixty thousand claims have been disallowed and half that number with disabilities traceable to the service have asked and received hospitalization from the Government since their discharge; a fourth of these are in hospitals to-day. Five thousand enter and 3,500 leave hospitals every month—a steady, consistent, every-30-days gain of 1,500 infirm men. Dry statistics, perhaps, but remember that every unit in this tremendous total represents a man who played his part in saving his country and who is still paying the price.

Mr. President, I learn from the same source that the disabilities of 513,000 of the 641,000 men discharged as disabled are known to have been classified—46,310 as tubercular, 76,588



as mental and nervous, and the remainder, 390,202, as general; subdivided—75,000 as surgical, 62,869 as eye, ear, nose, and throat, 22,847 as miscellaneous, and 229,888 as medical. These are briefly, in figures, the premises upon which the Government's program of hospitalization, compensation, and vocational rehabilitation for the disabled man must go forward.

Experts estimate that the peak of the problem will not be reached for 10 years and that in the meantime \$5,000,000,000 must be spent in its solution. More than a half billion has been spent already. Even this estimate, with its vague intimation of what may be expected, is only tentative, and liable, if anything, to undershoot the mark. Consider that a total of 579,115 invalid claims were allowed in the 36 years following the Civil War for an army of 2,400,000 men, and that, with the same proportion holding good, there will be 1,209,950 disability claims for the 5,041,470 veterans of the World War in the year 1956, and you have a puzzle to work out that it will take Congress and the Government years to untangle.

That ex-service claims for compensation actually to be allowed will amount as high as half a million, that the number of applicants for vocational training will grow from 125,000 to 300,000, and that those who must have hospital care and treatment will increase from 20,000 at one time to 50,000 at one time is a conservative prediction tentatively held by the public health experts.

As shortsighted as we are, we can certainly see the immediate needs of the disabled ex-service man. The Bureau of War Risk Insurance is responsible for seeing that he gets his compensation, the Federal Board for Vocational Education that he gets his vocational training, and both the Public Health Service and the Bureau of War Risk Insurance that he gets bed, doctor, nurse, and treatment in a hospital.

Mr. President, the fact that 5,000 ex-service men with disabilities traceable to their service are falling by the wayside every 30 days is something which seems to me ought to be worthy of the deepest concern and thoughtful attention by every Member of this body. These men are sons of your neighbor and of my neighbor. To them we owe an obligation that we can not afford to ignore. We have written laws upon the statute book which provide for them hospital care and treatment, compensation, and vocational training, and it is manifestly our duty to see that they get the benefit of these laws in their full intent and purpose. The welfare of these men is seriously threatened. To cut the appropriations for their rehabilitation during the coming year by \$100,000,000 is to assume a responsibility which I for one do not care to have a part in.

Mr. President, I feel that the matter of hospitalization for these men is of the most pressing importance. On January 15 and February 3 there appears in the *Record* a letter from the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service which should have most serious consideration by Congress. He states "that 10,000 beds are urgently needed for the care of tubercular and mentally diseased ex-service men." He states that on January 1, 1921, there were 19,019 disabled ex-service men under treatment by the Public Health Service as patients of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance—7,586 of them suffering from tuberculosis, 5,690 of them with mental disorders, and 5,743 of them with medical and surgical disabilities. He further discloses the fact that nearly one-half of these men are in contract or leased institutions run for profit. He might have gone further and stated that many of them have landed in State insane asylums along with the criminal and pauper insane; that many of them have been arrested and thrown in jail and then committed to insane asylums; and that some of them have been found in county institutions for the poor.

As a matter of fact, nearly half of these men are scattered all over the United States in more than 1,200 hospitals, State asylums, and institutions where they are put by the Public Health Service and paid for at the rate of approximately \$3 a day. This is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs, and there is little wonder that the American Legion and other ex-service organizations are raising a cry for better hospital treatment for these men and for new Government hospitals.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that there will be twice as many disabled men in hospitals during the approaching fiscal year as there were this year, the reduction of the amount to be appropriated for their hospital treatment by \$17,000,000 is a piece of economy to which I refuse to subscribe. That \$17,000,000 should be put back into the appropriation for the hospitalization of these men during the coming year.

Mr. President, we have heard much about salvage in connection with the World War. There is no more important kind of salvage than the salvage of human lives. Dr. Thomas W. Salmon, a great medical expert, connected with the Rockefeller Foundation, says that at least a half of the 71,237 ex-service men suffering from mental disorders as a result of their service

can be restored to a useful place in society by adequate and proper hospital treatment. Experts in tuberculosis estimate that at least one-third of the 38,033 men discharged from the Army with tuberculosis, as a result of service, can have their disease arrested. What this Congress does with reference to the appropriations for hospital treatment during the coming year for these men and for the erection of new hospitals is a life-and-death matter to these men.

Further than that, provision must be made for new Government hospitals into which these men may be gathered from all sorts of makeshift institutions—private hospitals run for profit, county farms, and State insane asylums—and given care and treatment worthy of their fine service and splendid sacrifice. There have been bills pending on the calendar of both the House and the Senate making appropriations for the construction of these hospitals since June 3 last. The France bill appropriating \$29,533,000 (S. 3457) is now on the calendar of the Senate. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, as I have said before, states that 10,000 beds are urgently needed and estimates that they can be provided at an average cost of \$3,000 a bed. Reports from all sources indicate that the present system under which the disabled men are turned over to private and State and county institutions for care under contract is most unsatisfying. The Government should build hospitals and should build them at once, as the men are knocking at the Government's door every day for treatment. We should pass the France bill, and pass it with all the speed possible.

Mr. President, the Government seems to have fallen down completely in its provisions for the care and treatment of disabled ex-service men. The provisions of the health bureau, war-risk insurance, and vocational education seemed to be admirable, and on paper were admirable. In operation the entire machine has broken down; and, in fact, never got well started. There has been no failure connected with the Great War in any branch or department of the Government so abject and shameful as the failure of the care and protection of the soldier. It is a disgrace to the Government that thousands of ex-service men, through disabilities, are to-day in almshouses, asylums, and even in filthy jails, due to the failure of the Government to keep its pledge to provide for their needs. This matter should supersede all others, no matter how urgent they are made out to be, in Congress. The relief of the returned soldier should have precedence over measures for the relief of any other class of the community.

Mr. President, while speaking of the needs of the disabled veterans of the World War, I think, in justice to the ex-service men and women of the country, it should be said that of the five things they are asking from this Congress, four of them are all in the interest of the disabled men.

Of course, we have all heard about the bill which the legion calls the adjusted compensation bill, and which is more generally known as the bonus bill. It was passed last summer by the House and hearings have been held on it recently in the Senate Finance Committee. This bill, as you doubtless know, provides that any veteran may have the optional choice of a cash bonus, land settlement, farm and home aid, vocational training, or Government insurance certificate.

Mr. President, I am one of those who believes that an adjustment of compensation should be made at once to the men and women whose economical fortunes were seriously embarrassed by their war service. I think we should remove the penalty these men and women paid because of their generous service to the Nation. I hope to see this adjusted compensation bill, sometimes called the "bonus" bill, passed by this Congress without delay.

Members of the Senate have perhaps heard far less of the other four things which the ex-service men and women of the country are asking. As said before, they are all in the interest of the disabled. They form, with the adjusted compensation or bonus bill, the entire legislative program of the American Legion, which is the largest organization of ex-service men and women, with a paid-up membership of over a million and with a paper membership of approximately twice that size.

The veterans are asking—

(1) That the Senate pass the Wason bill, which was passed by the House at the last session and is now pending in the Senate Finance Committee. This bill provides for 14 regional branches of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and as many sub-offices as necessary, and also to make it possible for ex-service men and women to pay their Government insurance premiums at any post office. It relieves from the payment of premiums on Government insurance all disabled men in hospitals, all disabled men taking vocational training, and all disabled men temporarily unable to follow any gainful occupation. It extends the time in which ex-service men may apply for hospital treatment

from one year after discharge to one year after the passage of this act. This bill is one that not only will greatly improve the efficiency of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance but one that contains many features of justice for the disabled ex-service men.

(2) The bill, for which I am the sponsor in the Senate, introduced in the House by Representative JOHN JACOB ROGERS, of Massachusetts, and upon which hearings have been held by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, is designed to consolidate the three agencies of the Government dealing with the disabled ex-service men. I do not doubt that all Members of the Senate have had practical experience with these bureaus in handling claims of disabled ex-service men of their States, which makes it unnecessary for me to go into any great detail as to the reasons why some such legislation of this kind is necessary.

(3) There is another piece of legislation, the France bill, of which I have already spoken, which forms a part of the legion program. It is legislation providing for the erection of new Government hospitals for the treatment of the disabled. Bills looking to this end are on the calendars of both the House and Senate.

(4) The Stevenson bill establishes the same provision of retirement for disabled officers of the emergency forces as is now enjoyed by officers of the Regular Army, a provision already accorded by Congress to the emergency officers of the Navy. These disabled emergency officers went to the battle front and suffered the same hardships and dangers as did the officers of the Regular Army. It is preposterous that now that it is all over we should discriminate and say to one group of officers: "You may retire on three-fourths pay for life, regardless of the percentage of your disability," and to another group of officers: "You may go back to civil life and get what you can from the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, anywhere from \$8 a month to \$100 a month, depending upon how badly bungled up you are."

It is all the more preposterous that we should discriminate as between the emergency officers of the Army and those of the Navy. I believe a careful review of the legislative program, which the national legislative committee of the American Legion has formulated and which the American Legion is asking at this session of Congress, will commend itself to Members of this body as a most worthy one. I hope to see the entire program acted upon favorably and promptly.

Four of the five things asked for, as I have already stated, are for the disabled, and the national legislative committee of the American Legion has repeatedly stated to me—in fact, the last national convention of this great organization emphatically so stated—that the disabled men shall come first; that nothing is wanted or desired for the great body of ex-service men and women until their unfortunate comrades who are still fighting the unfinished battle against sickness and wounds are properly cared for.

Mr. President, the disabled ex-service men of the World War have a first mortgage on the affections and fortunes of the American people. Congress has no more sacred obligations than to provide for their rehabilitation. There can be no possible excuse for a country as great and wealthy as ours to allow the men whose bodies and minds were shattered carrying the American flag to victory against an enemy which threatened the safety, honor, and welfare of our Government to now become the wards of charity or the victims of neglect, mistreatment, red tape, and destitution.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I move an amendment, on page 92, line 15, to strike out the numerals "\$200,000" and to substitute therefor "\$225,000."

This item, Mr. President, relates to the establishment, maintenance, and operation of mining experiment stations. The estimate for this purpose was \$270,000. The bill carries \$200,000, the same amount as was appropriated last year. The additional \$70,000 was asked for by the Bureau of Mines for the purpose of providing for the establishment and maintenance of an additional mining experiment station as provided for in the act of March 3, 1915.

Eight of these mining experiment stations have been already located—one at Columbus, one at Minneapolis, one at Bartlesville, Okla., one at Seattle, Wash., one at Fairbanks, Alaska, one at Tucson, Ariz., one at Rolla, Mo., and one jointly at Tuscaloosa and Birmingham, Ala.

The greatest mining camp in the United States and, perhaps, in the world, the city of Butte, has until now been neglected. It was the purpose of the Bureau of Mines to establish one of the additional stations in the city of Butte, Mont. From an area there the radius of which does not exceed 1 mile one-fifth of the world's entire production of copper comes. The same region is fast becoming exceedingly important in the pro-

duction of zinc, and the State of Montana leads in the production of silver, a by-product of the copper ores of that district.

I have on my desk a memorandum from the Bureau of Mines telling of the work of the mining experiment stations, which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD, but I read in this connection the last paragraph thereof, as follows:

Due to its proximity and contact with one of the greatest mining camps of the world, it is believed that a station established at Butte should give attention to mining rather than metallurgical problems. Moreover, it is believed there is no place in the world where mining problems could be studied to better advantage than at Butte.

The mining experiment stations, Mr. President, bear the same relation to the mining industry as the agricultural experiment stations do to agriculture. They are very appropriately located at places where are located mining schools. The State Mining College is located at Butte, Mont., and the work of the Butte experiment station will be carried on in connection with that institution.

I hope that there will be no objection to the amendment. I have a letter from the Director of the Bureau of Mines saying that if an additional appropriation of \$25,000 is granted, it will suffice for the establishment and maintenance for the current year of the station at Butte. I also ask that that letter be incorporated in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STERLING in the chair). In the absence of objection, the matter referred to by the Senator from Montana will be incorporated in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

#### JUSTIFICATION FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A MINING EXPERIMENT STATION AT BUTTE.

As a rule every mining company is desirous of carrying on its work in such a manner as to prevent waste and protect the life and health of the miner. Those familiar with the work of the Bureau of Mines know it has to do principally with these two things; that is, the prevention of waste and the health of the miner. Therefore, both the mining companies and the bureau are interested in the same lines of work, but that phase in which the mining company is particularly interested is the getting of the ore out of the ground as cheaply as possible, and does not concern itself so much with the subject of waste, except as it relates to profit, whereas the bureau is more concerned with the prevention of waste as it relates to conservation. Nevertheless the bureau realizes that the mining companies can not be expected to take steps to prevent waste unless it be economically feasible to do so. Therefore, it is first necessary to prove to the mining companies, either as regards safety or prevention of waste, that it is for their best interests to inaugurate the changes which have been advocated by the bureau.

For example, in 1916, the bureau's engineers began an investigation in one of the larger mining camps of the country as regards miner's consumption. This investigation was undertaken with the full consent of all of the big mining companies of the district. As a result of this investigation it was soon determined that one of the most essential factors governing underground health conditions, as well as efficiency, was the matter of proper distribution of air. At numerous conferences with the companies' engineers, the bureau's engineers so expressed themselves and also in discussing the subject with company officials, both high and low, until finally the matter became a very live issue.

At first the mining companies' engineers opposed the suggestions of the bureau's engineers, but when they carefully studied the subject themselves became convinced that they had not given the subject the careful study it should have had, and so informed the directors of their companies, and as a result, some two years after the work had begun, such changes were made in the ventilating system of the mines of one company as were needed to make better health conditions underground, which in turn assure the company increased capacity of its workmen, as well as a feeling among them that the company was looking out for their best interests.

As a result of this work every mining company of the district fell into line. For example, in one mine fans have been installed for the first time where the workmen claim carbide lamps were used because candles would not burn. In another mine, known as the hottest in the district and where the men could only work for a short time because of the stagnant and humid heat, fans have been installed and it is now one of the well ventilated mines of the district.

#### DUST.

In cooperation with representatives from the Public Health Service the bureau has proved conclusively that dust and fine particles in mines contribute to a great extent to the high death rate from miners' consumption and materially decrease the efficiency of the working forces. It was estimated, and this estimate was finally accepted as conservative by the officials of the company, that miners' consumption was costing the company \$2,500 per day in decreased efficiency of workers, pensioners, etc.

#### USE AND HANDLING OF EXPLOSIVES.

In a large majority of the mines of the country the method of handling explosives is dangerous and costly. This is true of even the very largest of the mining companies, who continue to have open magazines at all levels, and all miners are able to help themselves to as much dynamite as they desire at any time. The bureau has argued for the adoption of closed magazines and those mines which have adopted such magazines state that they save money by doing so. The bureau not only advocates closed magazines, with supervision over powder distribution, but also over the use of tamping materials. In some mines where the use of tampers and supervision of placing of holes has been adopted the claim is made of a saving of 20 to 25 per cent of explosives, which, if applied to all of the mines of one of the largest mining companies of the West, would amount to a saving of nearly \$300,000 per year. This saving would make it possible to mine an even lower grade of ore. Therefore, the bureau is not only interested in having methods adopted which will result in safety, but likewise in a saving of money, for the mining of a lower grade ore means increasing the ore reserves of the country to just that extent.

A great many other phases of the work in which the bureau is interested may be mentioned, but enough has been said to give some idea



of the plan which the bureau carries out in connection with work of this kind. It does not attempt to compel the mining companies to do this, that, or the other thing, but endeavors to cause them to recognize the cost to themselves of the continuance of bad conditions. However, it must not be understood that the only work which the bureau attempts to do is to show up defective and deplorable conditions in mining camps. It also endeavors to make a study of the many excellent methods of mining which are found in the various camps throughout the country and to disseminate this information to other mining camps.

For example, there is perhaps no mining camp in the country where as much has been spent on mechanical appliances as has been spent in the Butte district. Here thousands of dollars have been expended on mechanical devices, on safety methods underground and on the surface; some companies are experimenting on advanced methods of handling labor, others on the most improved fire prevention and control devices. Therefore the establishment of a station at Butte will permit of the bureau's engineers making a careful study of these, as before stated, and disseminating the information thus obtained, and would also permit of cooperative work being carried on with the mining companies of Butte as regards ventilation, mine fires, dust, best methods of drilling, use and handling of explosives, etc.

All of the above has to do with mining. Particular stress is laid on this subject due to the fact that at several of the other field stations of the bureau special attention is given to metallurgical treatment of ores—that is, to devising methods for the treatment of them—the object being the prevention of waste, by evolving processes which will make it commercially feasible to treat ores too complex or too low grade to be treated by present-day metallurgical processes.

Due to its proximity and contact with one of the greatest mining camps of the world, it is believed that a station established at Butte should give attention to mining rather than metallurgical problems. Moreover, it is believed there is no place in the world where mining problems could be studied to better advantage than at Butte.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
BUREAU OF MINES,  
Washington, February 7, 1921.

Hon. THOMAS J. WALSH,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In accordance with your request, I am writing to say that the estimates for the work of the Bureau of Mines during the next fiscal year, as approved by the Secretary of the Interior and the President, included an estimate for the establishment of two new mining experiment stations. Eight of the 10 mining experiment stations authorized by the act approved March 3, 1915, have already been established with an appropriation of \$200,000 for the work of these eight stations, i. e., \$25,000 for each station. The pending sundry civil bill carrying the appropriation for the work of the mining experiment stations contained no provision for new stations as the bill was reported by the House or as passed by the House or as reported to the Senate. If provision is made for one or both of the two new stations yet to be established under the act of March 3, 1915, the appropriation for "Expenses, mining experiment stations," should be increased by at least \$25,000 for each of these stations.

Cordially, yours,

H. FOSTER BAIN,  
Acting Director.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana will be stated.

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 92, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "\$200,000" and in lieu thereof to insert "\$225,000."

MR. WARREN. Is the Senator of the opinion that the amount proposed will cover the matter to which he has referred?

MR. WALSH of Montana. Yes. The letter which I have asked to have printed in the RECORD so states.

MR. WARREN. Very well. I shall not object to the amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

MR. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the amendment of the committee in lines 14 and 15, on page 8. The item of \$195,000 carried in the House bill was stricken out and the item of \$170,000—a reduction of \$25,000—was inserted in its place. I have been informed that that was done in pursuance of representations made by the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, in which he advised the committee that the total appropriation carried in the bill, including the item of \$195,000 in line 14 for field engineers and of \$125,000 in line 11 for the office force of the Supervising Architect's Office, were sufficient, but that they ought to be readjusted; that \$25,000 could be stricken from the item of \$195,000 and added to the item of \$125,000 in line 11. It seems, however, that the committee—whether from inadvertence or whether intentionally I do not know—while striking out the \$25,000 from the appropriation for the field force, failed to add anything to the appropriation for the office force, and I should like to move that that be reinserted.

MR. WARREN. Mr. President, this matter was before the committee; it was duly considered and a good deal of time was spent over it. What the Senator wishes to do in carrying out the wishes that have been expressed to him is to raise the salaries in that office. They have asked for the raise. We have in this bill uniformly carried out the idea that we are going immediately in the new Congress, or very soon, to take up the matter of readjustment and reclassification, which we have legislated for and which we have spent a good deal of money to obtain, and handle that office with all others; but if we commence on the raising of salaries as such in anyone of these

offices, the same argument goes all through as to the others, and the whole structure is put in confusion.

As to the cutting-down part, that occurred because of this fact: We have passed no public buildings bills for the construction of new buildings for a long time. There is no prospect of passing any at this session, and the work is slack. Therefore the statement was made before the committee that whatever we did with the other amount, that one could be cut down. I am aware that when the witness before us said that it could be cut down, he had the wish in his heart to retain all of the amount with which to raise the salaries of employees and use all the excess money for that purpose. I find that we have this state of affairs before us: When a man comes before us from a department, we will say, a chief clerk in charge of the clerks and laborers, he will first talk about the shortage of men. When we count up and deal with him as to the number of men, he will say: "Well, we can do without a certain number if we can raise the salaries of others." That is more the way they do, of course, in private business; but until we can rearrange these salaries I shall have to object, so far as I am concerned, to any changes in this bill in the line of raising salaries.

I shall have, therefore, to object to this amendment.

MR. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what is the theory upon which engineers in the field force are allowed a maximum of \$3,500 a year salary, and engineers in the office force are allowed a maximum salary of only \$2,500—a thousand dollars difference in the salaries of men of technical training and education who are engaged in practically the same kind of work, except that one is in the office and the other is in the field?

This amount of \$3,500 is not fixed as the salary for any particular number of men, but it is the maximum limit to which the department may go in paying the highest-priced men within the classes specified in this clause. It is represented to me that that is an unwarranted discrimination against the office force; that men who have the same qualifications and are called upon to perform equally as high a class of work in one instance are limited to a maximum salary of \$2,500, while their brothers, merely because they are in the field are allowed a salary of \$3,500.

MR. WARREN. The Senator evidently does not quite understand that situation.

MR. POINDEXTER. Perhaps not.

MR. WARREN. In the first place, it may happen that by education they may be quite similar, but there is a selection of the best men for the most difficult work, which is, of course, in the field, where they have to meet the world; and there is another thing: Those inspectors who have to travel all over the United States are confined by law to a certain per diem allowance, which does not pay a very great proportion of their real per diem expenses, and the balance has to come out of their salaries, so that the net salary which they have left is not so much more than the others receive.

MR. POINDEXTER. I notice that on lines 4 and 5 provision is made for structural engineers at a maximum salary of \$2,500, while in lines 12 and 13 supervising superintendents, superintendents, and junior superintendents are allowed a maximum salary of \$3,500 per annum.

MR. WARREN. From \$2,000 to \$3,500.

MR. POINDEXTER. Yes; and the other is from \$800 to \$2,500. Now, they might need in their office force, and, in fact, I should think that they do need, men of professional training and education as structural engineers. Why should they be put in an inferior class to superintendents of construction?

MR. WARREN. Mr. President, there is no use in prolonging the argument on my part. I say again that there is a difference. There is a difference in their duties. There is a difference in their responsibilities. They are selected for that purpose, and they have a much larger expense. I am perfectly willing that the Senate shall vote on the matter, of course; but I can not accept the amendment when it deals with a request which has been unanimously turned down after being very carefully considered in the committee.

MR. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I move to strike out the figure "2" and insert the figure "3" in line 5 on page 8, so as to equalize the maximum salaries which may be allowed to the office force with those which may be allowed to the field force. I hope the Senator will accept that amendment and allow it to go to conference.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 8, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,500 per annum" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,500 per annum."

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I can not accept that as the wish of the committee, and I hope it may be voted down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, on line 11, page 8, I move to strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$150,000," so as to restore the total of these two items to the same amount that was contained in the bill as passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, that is the same thing put in another form. The purpose of it is to raise those salaries. I ask that that amendment may not be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 8, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "\$125,000" and in lieu thereof to insert "\$150,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 19, line 16, it is proposed to strike out the word "and" and after the word "papers" in said line to insert the words "and for services in connection therewith."

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, this adds nothing whatever to the appropriation of \$100,000, but the appropriation is in terms "for library books, magazines, and papers," without any regard whatever to the library services that should be rendered; and this amendment is for the purpose of compensating those who render the service of librarians. Of course, these books, papers, and magazines can be used to the best advantage by the soldier boys when there is some direction and some guidance in the matter of their selection and the reading of the books; and the amendment is simply for that purpose.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I understand the Senator thinks that language is not sufficient. I am of the opinion that the language is sufficient. Is this to put on a number of men at certain salaries?

Mr. STERLING. If any salaries are paid, it will be under the \$100,000 appropriation. I understand the situation to be this—

Mr. WARREN. Let it go in, and let it go to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, on page 11, lines 12 and 13, the committee reduced the amount of the appropriation for "Public buildings, operating expenses," from \$3,800,000 to \$3,700,000. I ask unanimous consent for a reconsideration of the vote by which that amendment was adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York asks a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment on page 11, line 12, striking out "\$3,800,000" and inserting "\$3,700,000," was agreed to. Is there objection to a reconsideration?

Mr. WARREN. I object to that. That is all we ought to appropriate for that purpose. If that amount is too small we will hear from it later.

Mr. CALDER. Then I will reserve a separate vote on that amendment in the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. We have given them what they have under current law, and there is no reason why they should have more now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York reserves a separate vote on that amendment in the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. I desire to say, in this connection, that those expenses are on the receding scale now, as other expenses are, and we have given as much as was given last year.

Mr. SIMMONS. I would like to ask the Senator from Wyoming, the chairman of the committee, in reference to an amendment I offered yesterday evening.

Mr. WARREN. Has it been printed?

Mr. SIMMONS. It has been printed. It was read from the desk yesterday, and I discussed it, and I asked the Senator if he would not withdraw his point of order and let that amendment go through.

Mr. WARREN. I am not prepared to do that now. I was looking the matter up at the suggestion of the Senator. If the Senator will wait, I will look it up a little further before we finish the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then, Mr. President, while the Senator is investigating that I desire to offer another amendment. I ask

unanimous consent for a reconsideration of the vote on the amendment of the committee on line 13, page 15, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to reconsider the vote on the committee amendment on page 15, line 13. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish now to offer an amendment to strike out "\$6,750,000" and insert "\$7,000,000," thereby raising the appropriation \$250,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In the committee amendment, on page 15, line 13, the Senator from North Carolina proposes to amend the amount proposed to be inserted by the committee, which is \$6,750,000, so that it will be "\$7,000,000."

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, this is the total allowance proposed by the committee for the pay and allowances prescribed by law for the commissioned officers, cadets and cadet engineers, warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted men, active and retired, temporary cooks and surfmen, substitute surfmen, and one civilian instructor, authorized for the purpose of constituting the entire force of the Coast Guard.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me a moment? I notice, with regard to the provision the Senator proposes to amend, that the appropriation last year was \$5,776,000. This year the House allowed \$6,000,000, and the Senate committee has raised it to \$6,750,000; so that it is lacking a very few dollars, less than \$50, of being a million more than they had last year. Is not that sufficient to provide for the very laudable purpose which the Senator is about to discuss?

Mr. SIMMONS. I think I will be able to show that it is not.

Mr. President, there were somewhat extensive hearings in respect to this item both in the House committee and the Senate committee. Those hearings disclosed the fact that on account of the act of 1918 the pay of the Coast Guard officers and enlisted men was put upon the basis of the Navy pay, thereby substantially increasing the salaries of the force.

It also was disclosed that during the war all of the force, and during the last fiscal year a considerable portion of the force, were regular sailors, men trained in the service, and therefore efficient in the performance of their duties.

The commander in charge, Commodore Reynolds, stated that those sailors had practically all been retired from the service of the Coast Guard, and he had been compelled to recruit the present force of enlisted men from raw material. He testified that it takes a considerable time, I think probably two years, to train the new men to the point of efficiency of an ordinary sailor. It was stated that by reason of that fact, the enlisted men taken from civil life without training were hardly one-half as efficient as the force the service had during the period of the war.

It is true that the House increased the amount appropriated for last year, and it is true that the Senate added something to that, but both the increase made in the House and the increase made in the Senate committee do not equal the amount which the commandant states will be absolutely necessary to continue this service with efficiency.

Mr. President, the committee of the Senate simply allowed for this service an amount that will be required to maintain the service upon the basis of last year; that is to say, the appropriation recommended by the committee this time takes into consideration a certain number of commissioned officers, a certain number of warrant officers, both active and retired, and 3,751 enlisted men. That is the same number of enlisted men who are now in the service, the same number who were in the service last year, and practically the same number of warrant officers and commissioned officers who were in the service last year. The committee has allowed enough in this bill to pay the expenses of the same force that was employed in this service during the last fiscal year. That is correct, I think. The committee has provided no more, Mr. President. No provision is made for any enlargement of the service. No provision is made for an increase to the extent of a single enlisted man in the service. In other words, the committee has given this great service exactly the same force it had during the last fiscal year. It costs more to maintain the service with that force this year than it did last year, for the reasons I have given, the higher cost incident to the fact that these officers and these enlisted men are put upon the basis of pay in the Navy and the fact that the new men are not as efficient as the former force was.

That fact was made very clear, not only by Commodore Reynolds but by the other officials of the Coast Guard Service who appeared before the committee, and it was the purpose and the intent of the committee, as indicated by the hearings, to allow



no increase in the force employed during the last fiscal year, but to raise the amount, so as to provide for the increased salaries and the lesser efficiency of these men.

This course would be all right, there could be absolutely no quarrel about this disposition of this matter, provided it were not necessary to enlarge this force in order to accomplish the purpose of its inauguration and in order properly and efficiently to perform the functions that are assigned to that great arm of the Government.

I desire that Senators get that point in their minds, because I think every Senator here who lives anywhere along the coast, or who lives off the coast, is deeply interested in having this service maintained to a point of adequacy and efficiency. The committee, therefore, I repeat, while it raised the amount allowed, admittedly and confessedly provided a fund only sufficient to pay for the force that was employed during the last fiscal year and the force that is now in employment by the Coast Guard Service, and made no provision for any enlargement of that service as it now exists, and as it has existed during the past year.

Mr. President, I take it that nobody will question the great importance of this service. The duties of the men of the Coast Guard were stated in the hearings by Commodore Reynolds. According to him, they patrol the coasts, enforce the various navigation laws and laws relating to commerce and revenue, assist vessels in distress, save property, remove derelicts from the path of navigation, cruise in Bering Sea and the Arctic Ocean each season, patrol in the vicinity of the Grand Banks to give warning to vessels regarding ice conditions, patrol the coast during the stormy season of the year to render assistance to vessels in distress, and perform many other duties. The question and the only question I am raising is as to the adequacy of the service, of the force we allowed last year, and which this appropriation provides shall continue without any increase. That is the only question I raise. I assume that everybody will recognize the vast importance of this work.

Mr. President, let me read Senators what Commodore Reynolds said about this. I read from the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. How many ships have you now in operation?

Commodore REYNOLDS. Of all classes, 67.

The CHAIRMAN. How many are laid up?

Commodore REYNOLDS. There are laid up and out of commission of all classes, 35, and there are 5 under construction.

The CHAIRMAN. Did not the Navy Department turn over some ships to you?

Commodore REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Some of those that are not in commission are undesirable ships that were turned over to you by the Navy Department?

Commodore REYNOLDS. Some of them are. A good many of them are those that we took over from the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. If you had them in repair or in commission, could you use them?

Commodore REYNOLDS. Yes, sir; all of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Are all of them suitable for your service?

Commodore REYNOLDS. We could use them.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you proposing to put more of those ships in commission as you can get men?

Commodore REYNOLDS. As we can get the men; yes, sir. Some of these are regular vessels of the service that we had prior to the war, but we have been unable to operate them for some time.

The CHAIRMAN. Because you could not get the men?

Commodore REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men would you employ if you could get them? Would you employ enough to put all of those 35 additional ships in commission?

Commodore REYNOLDS. Yes, sir; some of the vessels are small and could be operated with but few men.

The CHAIRMAN. You will be able to get all the men you want.

Commodore REYNOLDS. We want a total enlisted force of 5,893 men; we should have in all 518 warrant officers.

Now the bill allows them, instead of 5,893 enlisted men, only 3,751 enlisted men. Because they were not able to employ this year for lack of funds more than 3,751 men, 35 vessels, that Commodore Reynolds stated could be used and were needed in the service, are tied up and out of commission.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. SIMMONS. The committee's proposition here is that the service must be operated as it was last year with something near 2,000 enlisted men less than the commodore declares are necessary in order that the service may be properly performed in the interest of the American people and especially that part of them who go themselves or send their property by the sea. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. The point has been made to me, and I call the Senator's attention to it in order that I may be enlightened, first, that there is no necessity for 5,000 men; that a very much smaller force could perform all of the work that is required to be performed. Secondly, if I may be permitted, a person who is very familiar with the matter came to me several days ago and stated that some of the work that is being performed by this service could, with the utmost propriety, be performed by

some of the naval boats; that many of them were disengaged and many of the sailors were doing nothing; and that these trips out in the ocean, up to Newfoundland and farther out from the coast, ought to be performed by naval boats rather than by the Coast Guard.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know how that may be, but I do know that the naval boats are not performing the service, and the people of the country are losing the benefit of the service by reason of the situation I have portrayed. I call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that I am not asking in the amendment for an increase to the extent of 2,000 men, the number that Commodore Reynolds said are needed. I am asking for only 250 additional men.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator says we are losing benefit. Just what is the benefit to which the Senator alludes that we would lose?

Mr. SIMMONS. We are losing the benefit of efficient patrolling of our coast. As I will show the Senator before I get through, the most important point upon the Atlantic coast today, the great center of danger upon the Atlantic coast—

Mr. WARREN. Danger of what?

Mr. SIMMONS. The point that has been regarded for 100 years as the graveyard of the South Atlantic coast is absolutely without the benefit either of patrol or of adequate assistance in case of vessels wrecked or otherwise in distress.

Mr. WARREN. The Coast Guard has been immensely increased in past years, and it seems difficult to tell just what they are to do. Of course, in war times there might be some necessity of a little closer vigil, but I do not understand that we are liable to be exposed to any increasing danger or any other danger that twice as many men might save us from.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have tried to explain to the Senator that I do not think the Coast Guard is a defense service. It is not so specified in the description I have just read from Commodore Reynolds. It is not a defense service. Its functions are entirely different.

I will read again, as the Senator does not seem to have heard what I first read. Describing what the force does, Commodore Reynolds says:

They patrol the coast.

One of the purposes of that patrol is to protect our ports against smuggling. That is one purpose. I will say to the Senator that North Carolina has, connected with the sea by a sand bank an average of less than half a mile in width, an area of 3,000 square miles of navigable waters. Leading into those sounds are three inlets—Beaufort Inlet, Hatteras Inlet, and Ocracoke Inlet. But for the surveillance of the cutter service those vast inland waters would be easily accessible to the smuggler. In fact, I am told that now, by reason of inefficient and inadequate supervision there, with reference to our liquor traffic, the country bordering on those inland waters has become a place for the manufacture of illicit spirits that are taken out through these inlets connecting the sound with the ocean. It is easy to use those waters for such a purpose. In the case of smuggling, more or less of which is always going on, here is a great stretch of the coast with three inlets leading into a body of 3,000 square miles of inland navigable water, where the smuggler could ply his trade with absolute impunity. That is the first function of the Coast Guard. The next is:

Enforce the various navigation laws and laws relating to commerce and revenue.

Those are the laws about which I have just spoken, laws that are so often violated by the smuggler, laws that would be easily violated by smugglers unless we had some service such as the Coast Guard to protect the country against it.

Assist vessels in distress.

The only governmental service that we have in the country organized and equipped for the purpose of assisting vessels in distress is the Coast Guard Service. This service not only assists vessels in case of wrecks, but assists them also when in distress arising from other causes. When we consider that we have something over 3,000 miles of coast, a large part of it dangerous coast, is it to be said that the Government of the United States is not at all times, in the interest not only of property but of humanity, to provide ample relief measures to those who go down to the sea, whether they go as passengers or send their property as freight?

Commodore Reynolds then says:

The Coast Guard men render assistance to vessels in distress and perform many other duties. We assist in some manner about every department of the Government during the course of the year. By the way, I might interject here that a great many of the men are needed for the shore stations.

Now, who is to determine the question of whether or not the force now in employment and now provided for by appropri-

tion in the bill as amended by the committee is adequate? The fact can not be controverted under any circumstances that the service is now in possession of 35 boats, some of them the best boats in the service, that are now out of commission and tied up at the docks because the service has not sufficient men to operate them. I am prepared to say that some of the boats that have been taken out of commission because of the lack of crews to operate them are absolutely essential to a proper patrolling and policing of our coasts and in order to give reasonable relief facilities to vessels that may be wrecked or get into distress in navigating our coastwise waters.

If I may have the attention of the Senator from Wyoming, the chairman of the committee, let me give him an illustration of the situation: I live in the town of Newbern, which is on the inland waters of which I spoke a little while ago. Newbern is only a few miles from Beaufort Inlet. When I was in the other House of Congress thirty-odd years ago a bill introduced by myself was passed authorizing the construction of a revenue cutter for the purpose of protecting those 3,000 square miles of inland waters and their three inlets from the sea. Navigation in those waters is dangerous. I have been in a storm at sea and I have been in a storm on those inland waters, and I feel and believe that the danger to which I was subjected in the storm upon these comparatively shallow inland waters was infinitely greater than in the storm on the ocean. Vessels navigating those inland waters get in trouble. The Government at this time is operating a regular line of boats, running two or three times a week, through those sounds from the city of Baltimore to the city of Newbern and to the city of Washington, in North Carolina. That line is a regular line, and it incurs these dangers.

The revenue cutter to which I refer was provided for the purpose of patrolling those waters and, in addition, for the purpose of rendering assistance to distressed vessels or to wrecked vessels on the sea outside along the adjacent North Carolina coast. The revenue cutter was afterwards—I think, during the Spanish-American War—taken away and another vessel, especially constructed with a view to the navigation of those inland waters, was provided and was located at Newbern, in close proximity to the dangerous coast of Cape Hatteras and Cape Lookout, in order that it might be there at all times ready to render prompt assistance to vessels navigating that portion of our coast. That vessel was stationed at the port of Newbern and was known as the *Pamlico*. It is a splendid cutter. It remained at Newbern until the beginning of the late war, rendering splendid service not only upon those inland waters but rendering help in case of accident at Hatteras or Cape Lookout, and patrolling the coast from time to time in storms. When the war began that vessel was taken away, because it was said that it was urgently needed in other Government service made necessary by the then existing war conditions.

I know as a matter of fact that Commodore Reynolds has desired for more than a year to return that vessel to Newbern; that he has felt that it is needed there; yet during that period of time he has not been able to return it.

Only a month or two ago when the chamber of commerce of my city communicated with me by resolution impressing me as much as they could with the importance in connection with the navigation of those inland waters as well as in connection with the troubles about the Capes, of returning that vessel, and urged me to use my best endeavor to secure its return, I again applied to the Coast Guard Service, and again the answer came back that, on account of the inadequacy of the money at his command, the commandant was not able to provide a sufficient crew to operate the vessel; that the vessel was ready; that the department was ready to restore it to its former use, but did not have the money with which to provide a crew for it.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. But the Senator's argument fails to show that there is any reason why the vessel could not be returned.

Mr. SIMMONS. Except that Commodore Reynolds says he has not the money.

Mr. WARREN. Very well; but he had the money in years past, though he then had very much less appropriations than we are giving him now.

Mr. SIMMONS. He has not had sufficient money, as I understand, since the war ended to return the ship to the station at Newbern.

Mr. WARREN. We are providing in this bill \$600,000 more than that service had last year.

Mr. SIMMONS. But Commodore Reynolds can not send the vessel back because he has not sufficient crews. There has not been added one single man to his crews in this bill.

Mr. WARREN. We appropriate \$600,000 more than was appropriated last year, which he said was for crews; and we are attempting to appropriate here a million dollars, a sum that never has been before reached or anything near it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does not the Senator know that is disclosed in the hearings before his own committee, that the amount allowed Commodore Reynolds was based upon the employment of 3,751 enlisted men, and that is the same number he had last year?

Mr. WARREN. We are giving the service more than heretofore, and the commandant could employ as many men as he saw fit with the money allowed; but, of course, if the idea is to double the cost, to double the number of men, the Senator's argument is all right.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is not the argument.

Mr. WARREN. To say that the ship was taken away because of a lack of men for the crew is not a suggestion of any force, because it was taken away at a time when they had perhaps two-thirds or a half as much money for the service as now. They had the ship then and kept it there. Now we are giving nearly double the appropriation, and the Senator says that they have not money enough.

Mr. SIMMONS. No, Mr. President. From the hearings, from the questions asked by the members of the committee, and according to the basis upon which they allowed the present increase in the appropriation, it is perfectly clear there will only be permitted the employment of 3,751 men. Provision has been made for the salaries of only that number of men.

Mr. WARREN. We did not say how many men shall be employed. The money is in the commandant's hands to do as he chooses with it.

Mr. SIMMONS. The commodore told the committee that that sum would only enable him to retain his present force.

Mr. WARREN. No.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then the committee figured out how much he had to have to pay each man.

Mr. WARREN. He did not say what the Senator indicates.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, if it is necessary I can read the testimony.

Mr. WARREN. But we have added since that time \$600,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. What the committee did was to estimate the pay of the enlisted men at \$1,004, and, after providing for the commissioned officers and the warrant officers, the amount that was appropriated only left enough money to employ 3,751 men, the same number that were employed during the last year. That is absolutely true; there can not be any question about it. The salaries of these men are fixed; it is not a case of a lump sum being provided; commissioned officers receive so much—\$2,500 a year, I believe—warrant officers receive so much—I do not remember the amount paid them—and enlisted men receive so much, namely, \$1,004. The committee made careful calculations and allowed the commandant of the service enough to pay for the present commissioned force, the present warrant officers, and the present enlisted strength. There can not be any question about that. The commandant can not restore to the service the ship to which I have referred; he can not get the men; he had not the money to pay them last year, and he has this year no more money with which to employ additional men than he had last year. Therefore he can not employ the men necessary to restore the ship to the service.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator insist that the commandant will not have, under the amount proposed, \$600,000 more than he had last year?

Mr. SIMMONS. But the salaries have increased; the committee made calculations as to the number of enlisted men based upon a pay of \$1,004 a year, and upon that basis allowed the commandant enough money to employ 3,751 enlisted men, which is the same force he had last year.

Mr. WARREN. We made no calculation per man; we made no calculation as to the number of men; there is no reason why he can not employ less or more as he sees fit, so far as the law is concerned. As to the advance in pay, the men received the same last year that it is proposed they will receive this year.

Mr. SIMMONS. The report absolutely reeks with inquiries by members of the committee as to the salary paid the enlisted men, as to how many men could be employed with the money allowed; as to the salary of the commissioned officers and the warrant officers, and as to the number of officers who could be employed with the money allowed. The testimony is that the amount allowed by the committee will permit the commandant to employ, paying the salaries fixed by law, not provided for



in a lump sum—he can not control the question of salaries—identically the same force during the coming year that he had the last year.

Mr. President, I say there can be no expansion of the service under those circumstances and not one of the 35 boats which have been tied up and which Commodore Reynolds, who ought to know something about this matter, says are needed can be restored to the service.

Now, let me proceed a little further with the statement I was making in regard to the *Pamlico*. I wish to call the attention of the chairman and the committee—and I hope the chairman will listen to me—and the attention of the Senate also to this matter, because it is vital.

The conditions which now exist and against which Commodore Reynolds desires relief as it applies to the North Carolina coast are these: There is not a single revenue cutter, not a single patrol boat, not a single boat of any kind owned and operated by the Coast Guard Service between the port of Norfolk and the port of Wilmington, N. C.; that is between Cape Henry, near Norfolk, and Southport, near Wilmington, a stretch of over 300 miles of coast. I will ask my colleague if I am not correct about that.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think it is just about that distance.

Mr. SIMMONS. At about the center of that long coast line lies Hatteras with its shoals running 40 or 50 miles into the ocean, and a few miles below lies Cape Lookout with its long shoals running 10, 15, or 20 miles into the ocean. I think I have underestimated rather than overestimated the length of those shoals. Vessels navigating that coast in order to be perfectly safe have to make a detour of nearly 100 miles. It is known of all men that more wrecks have occurred upon the shoals of Hatteras and of Cape Lookout than at any other place on the Atlantic coast. There has not passed a year during my manhood life—and I live within 35 or 40 miles of that place—when those treacherous shoals have not been the cause of wreck after wreck, involving the loss of life and the loss of property amounting to millions upon millions of dollars. And yet, Mr. President, whereas, when this revenue cutter that I am now talking about, the *Pamlico*, was in commission it was within a few miles of those dangerous waters, ready to give relief in case of distress and wreck, now there is no boat within less than a hundred or a hundred and fifty miles of that place whose duty it is to patrol those waters. I am told that one of the chief duties of these Coast Guard cutters is not only to assist in case of wreck, but, in case of stormy weather conditions along the coast, to patrol it up and down, so as to be there promptly and render relief, especially at the danger points; and yet if a vessel is in distress there, it must wait now until a cutter 150 miles away can come to its relief, whether it applies to Norfolk for assistance or to Wilmington.

Mr. President, I have just had a letter from officials of the city of Wilmington telling me that if the *Seminole*, which is the cutter located there, has to patrol and police those waters and go to the relief of vessels stranded around Hatteras and Cape Lookout it will be absolutely necessary that the Government shall send a boat there with a wider range; that the radius of the boat—its cruising radius, I understand that to mean—is inadequate, on account of its very limited coal-carrying capacity, to enable it, even if it were otherwise able, to cover that large area, and therefore it would be necessary to have a better boat there.

Mr. President, I sympathize with the arguments made here in behalf of economy. I believe in cutting down the expenses of this Government wherever we prudently can; but, in the name of Heaven, let us not cut them down in such a way as to deny to the people of this country that protection upon our seacoast that they have always heretofore enjoyed and to which they are entitled.

And, Mr. President, in former times, when our trade with South and Central America and with the West Indian Islands was small compared with what it is now, when that trade was conducted in foreign bottoms, there was not the same argument in favor of the proper relief provisions being made here so far as property was concerned; but now, with our trade with these countries already grown great, expanding every day, carried chiefly in American bottoms, in vessels flying the American flag, representing the money of the Government and of the people as well as private capital, it seems to me that to take away the protection we have heretofore afforded to those who navigate our coastal waters is almost criminal.

I know how the people in my country feel with regard to the lack of protection such as the Government gives through this service, and always has given through this service, at Hatteras and Cape Lookout. They look upon it as absolutely inexcusable.

I have here a memorandum from Commander Reynolds in which he says:

The sum of \$6,000,000 is necessary under the item "pay and allowance" to maintain the enlisted force of the Coast Guard at 3,751—

That is where it was last year, and where it is now—

the number of enlisted men actually in the service on January 11, 1921, which number was used as a basis for our statements in the hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations. That number of men did not permit the placing of the *Pamlico* in commission.

I was writing him about the *Pamlico* and inquiring whether or not he would be able to place her in commission.

If the sum of \$7,000,000 be appropriated for pay and allowance, it is thought that we may be able to have a sufficient number of men to justify us in placing the *Pamlico* in commission again.

All I am asking is to add \$250,000 to the amount recommended by the committee. There is not a line nor a syllable in the committee's bill as it now stands that permits of any expansion from the present conditions of inadequacy. My amendment does not allow much expansion; but there is a boat up here in Maryland, operating out from Baltimore on the Chesapeake Bay, I believe, known as the *Apache*, that is just like this—in the same situation as the *Pamlico*—a splendid boat, tied up, greatly needed in those waters teeming with commerce. She is tied up because the service has not sufficient money, and sufficient money is not allowed in the committee amendment, to employ a crew to restore her to service.

Mr. President, I should not have taken the time I have taken if I did not feel deeply about this matter. I think the service of the Coast Guard is one of the noblest services that the Government is rendering to humanity. I think it is one of the finest services the Government is rendering for the protection and safety of property. I think to withdraw that service, where it has been long established and where its necessity has been demonstrated by time, is unjustifiable. But, Mr. President, to say that this service is to remain stationary in the face of the development of our foreign trade and its transportation in American vessels, I think, is more than unwarranted. It is inexcusable. It is an apparent economy, I will admit; it reduces the expenditures of the Government \$250,000; but it may cost the Government in the loss of one ship, not only flying the American flag but owned by the Government itself, millions upon millions of dollars.

I trust, Mr. President, that the amendment may be adopted.

Mr. McCUMBER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Harrison	McCormick	Sheppard
Calder	Hefflin	McCumber	Simmons
Capper	Henderson	McKellar	Smith, Ga.
Curtis	Hitchcock	McNary	Smith, S. C.
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Moses	Smoot
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Spencer
Elkins	Kendrick	New	Sutherland
Gay	Kenyon	Overman	Swanson
Glass	Keyes	Polindexter	Thomas
Gooding	King	Pomerene	Thammell
Gore	Kirby	Ransdell	Underwood
Hale	Knox	Reed	Warren
Harris	Lodge	Robinson	Willis

Mr. HARRISON. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it seems that the Committee on Appropriations can not appropriate enough money to suit the Senate. Whenever an estimate is cut in any way, officials of the department or the division that is cut immediately proceed to the Capitol and undertake to secure the assistance of some one to compel the Senate, if possible, to give them all they demand.

For the Coast Guard there was appropriated last year \$5,576,000, and the House, after hearing the statement made by not only Commodore Reynolds but by Lieut. Commander Billard, decided to increase the appropriation to \$6,000,000.

The Senate committee, after going into the details carefully and figuring to the very dollar what they said they had now, increased that amount \$750,000, and now we are asked to increase the \$750,000 by \$250,000.

Senators, I want to call attention to the fact that the Senate committee has increased the appropriation over last year \$1,174,000. I want the Senate to listen to the details, and I want the Senate to decide then if the committee has not been more than liberal with the Coast Guard. I know, Mr. President, that the Coast Guard sent in an estimate for \$9,200,295, an increase

of almost 100 per cent over what they had last year, but after the House had heard the testimony they decided to give them an increase over last year's appropriation and make it \$6,000,000. Then the Senate committee has gone them one better and given them \$750,000 more.

When they appeared before the Senate committee they changed the amount they asked for from \$9,200,000 and said they could get along with about \$7,100,000. Then, as a member of the subcommittee, I asked Lieut. Commander Billard to give me an itemized statement as to how that lump sum would be expended and for what purposes. The lieutenant commander said they have 205 active commissioned officers in the service to-day, and the pay of those officers is \$1,118,577.

They have 71 retired commissioned officers, and the pay of those retired commissioned officers is \$210,054.

They have 508 retired warrant officers, and the pay of those warrant officers is \$534,600.

There were 417 warrant officers in the service, not last year but on the day they appeared before the committee, and the pay for those warrant officers amounted to \$1,421,500.

They have 3,751 enlisted men, not last July when the present appropriation was made, for at that time they had 3,708; and yet the appropriation for this whole purpose was only \$5,576,000, and all the increase there is in the personnel—that is, of enlisted men—is the difference between 3,708 and 3,751, or 43 enlisted men. Yet we are recommending for the Coast Guard nearly a million dollars more, and now they say they can not have the men to run one boat.

Those amounts added together, Mr. President, amount to \$6,667,984. The lieutenant commander spoke of some 40 cadets and 5 cadet engineers, and he wanted to add \$161,000. Adding the \$161,000, Mr. President, would give \$6,828,984. On the other hand, there are \$152 and \$5,160 to be taken off, and \$43,463 of difference in the warrant pay, making about \$6,780,000.

Mr. President, we gave them \$6,750,000, and I want to say to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] that I had a great deal of sympathy with the Coast Guard, and I wanted to give to the very last dollar they really needed; I wanted to give all the departments all they actually had to have; not what they asked for, for if we gave what was estimated this year the Treasury of the United States could not meet it. And in making that remark I do not mean the Coast Guard only; that applies to every estimate that came to the Congress.

What caused me to ask as to the details of the number of enlisted men, the number of warrant officers, and the number of commissioned officers was a statement the lieutenant commander made, that he must have the amount asked for or else all but 2,000 enlisted men would be discharged. I could not understand that, and we figured it out in detail, and I have the figures before me now; and in the hearing I asked him if those figures were not true, and if they were not in accordance with the conditions existing in the Coast Guard, and he said they were.

There was one question I forgot to ask him, and perhaps I ought to have asked it. Senators will notice that out of this lump-sum appropriation we have to pay 508 retired warrant officers \$534,600, and we have to pay 71 retired commissioned officers \$210,054.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me ask the Senator if those commissioned officers are retired because of overage, or for incapacity, or for what reason?

Mr. SMOOT. They are retired at the age of 64, according to law.

Mr. THOMAS. It is an age retirement?

Mr. SMOOT. It is an age retirement. But just think, Senators, of the whole amount appropriated for the Coast Guard, what a large percentage goes to pay retired officers.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is under an act of Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. I know it; I am not commenting on that. But I ought to have asked how many more commissioned officers and how many more warrant officers are to be retired this coming year. That I did not ask, and I can not tell. But I think, Mr. President, that unless there is a large number of retirements, the amount the Senate has put in this bill is all that ought to be carried, and I want frankly to say to the Senator from North Carolina that if the Senate conferees can keep in the bill what they have put in, \$750,000 more than the House has given them, I think they will do very well. I am going to stand for the \$6,750,000 for that service in conference. I do not mean to defend it here upon the floor, and in conference let it go. I believe the Coast Guard ought to have that amount of money, no matter if the House did allow an appropriation of but \$6,000,000, which was \$250,000 more than it allowed last year. But the Coast Guard, to do the work we intend it should do, and do it efficiently, ought to have the \$6,750,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the senior Senator from Utah yield to the junior Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. KING. I can not expect the Senator to keep in mind the figures during the prewar period, or at least for some period back, but approximately what was the amount appropriated for the Coast Guard, say in 1910, 1911, or 1912?

Mr. SMOOT. It was a small amount compared with what it is now. During the war we did increase the appropriations quite heavily, and even last year, as I said, we appropriated \$5,576,000.

Mr. KING. It seems to me there ought to be a return to pre-war conditions as soon as possible.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think we can do that, I will say to the Senator, for the reason that the work of the Coast Guard would not permit it. They are extending work on the Pacific coast and Alaska, and are extending the service generally, and if we are going to keep that service at all, we can not go back to pre-war conditions.

Mr. SIMMONS. I would like to say to the Senator that one of the principal items that brought about the increased expenditure in this service is the fact that during the war we put all of the commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men upon the same basis as the naval force, thereby greatly increasing the amount of expenditure in that connection.

Mr. SMOOT. Last year when we appropriated \$5,776,000, the increase was to take care of the increased allowances made to officers and enlisted men. In the amount that I have stated we allow \$1,003 for every enlisted man. We allow that in a lump sum.

Mr. SIMMONS. The committee have allowed just what the law allows; that and no more. I wish to say in addition to that—

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to answer that statement first. We allow just what the law allows the enlisted men, but whenever there is a change in number or an enlisted man resigns and goes out of the service, during the lapse of time before his place is filled or he is received back into the service that amount of money is saved out of the lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, I voted against the bill to make this an arm of the Navy merely for the purpose of granting allowances and retirements and increase of compensation. I thought it was wrong and an imposition upon the people. If I have any criticism, it is because of the generosity and, indeed, extravagance of the committee in reporting the large sum which the bill carries. If I had my way, I should strike a million dollars from the amount recommended by the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that would be a drastic position to take; and I want to save every dollar that I can to the Treasurer of the United States, too. Perhaps I have been a little tender-hearted with reference to the Coast Guard, but I think they made a pretty good case, and that was the reason why I voted for the \$750,000 increase over the House appropriation.

No one has charged that the service is not honorable. No one has intimated that the officers of the Coast Guard are not doing their duty. I recognize that the man who stands at the head of the Coast Guard is a splendid officer. I desire to say that I think a great deal of the present commander of the Coast Guard. He is a very fine man.

I took just what information I could get from them, and I do not believe there is a member of the subcommittee who heard that testimony who does not believe that the figures were absolutely correct. This is one of the cases where I am going to plead with the Senate to stand by the committee, because we have been more liberal here than with almost any other demand made upon the committee.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I do not recollect that Commodore Reynolds was before us.

Mr. SMOOT. He was for just a few minutes.

Mr. OVERMAN. He did not testify before us. He did not give us the information that is here to-day and the information that I have seen since the committee passed upon the item.

There is one thing certain, and that is that the committee, as the Senator from Utah has said, found that the House had not given them enough by \$750,000. The matter of the unpatrolled condition of the coast of North Carolina was not brought up and was not understood. The only question raised by Commodore Reynolds's letter is, Shall this long stretch of coast from Norfolk, Va., to Wilmington, N. C., go unprotected, unpoliced, unpatrolled? That is the question.

Commodore Reynolds said—and we gave him about what he wanted for his officers—that he needed more men. He has a



boat now, lying at Newbern, N. C., a good boat that he would like to man in order to patrol the coast, because it is so absolutely necessary. Every Member of the Senate knows that this is the most dangerous of all the coasts of the United States, to wit, from Cape Hatteras to Point Lookout. I need not refer to that. Does that need any protection? Does that need any police patrolling? If it does, the money asked for is needed. Who says it? Commodore Reynolds says it.

Who is Commodore Reynolds? As the Senator from Utah has said, he is one of the best men in the Navy. He did not testify, and that evidence was not before the committee, but the committee gave him \$750,000. He now says that he needs \$250,000 more. Then let us agree to the amendment so that he can get the boat and man it, and patrol from Cape Hatteras to Point Lookout, some 300 miles of coast line and sound lines and the great canal down there, so it may be fully protected and policed. Commodore Reynolds says it is absolutely necessary. Who knows? Does the commodore know? Does Commodore Reynolds know it, or does the Senator from Utah know it?

The Senator from Utah did not hear the evidence at the hearings. He did not have that information then, but he has it now over the sign manual of the commodore himself. If the money is needed, let us give it, in order that he may patrol that coast. In his evidence he said that the *Seminole* at Wilmington can not do it, and the revenue cutter at Norfolk can not do it, and therefore he needs a boat near Newbern, right near Cape Hatteras, right near Point Lookout, right at these three inlets in which there is a lot of smuggling done. Let us patrol it and control it, and let us give him the money to do it. If \$750,000 was necessary in the opinion of the Senator from Utah on the information he had, then with the other information now before us why not give \$250,000 more?

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to say that this is a lump-sum appropriation, and Commodore Reynolds can transfer the boats from any section of the United States to any other section. But suppose we grant that there ought to be an extra boat, suppose we grant that it ought to go to North Carolina, it is not going to cost \$250,000 to send that one boat. If that is what the Senators want, let us increase the amount \$50,000, because that will take care of it.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not know how much it will take.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not asking for just one boat. I made that pretty clear. I just gave that as an illustration of the lack of service at a particular point and the inability to furnish adequate service because they did not have the men to man the boats already in commission.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator, then, let us put it in in that way. Suppose he wanted 50 men for that little boat; at \$1,000 each it would be \$50,000, and that would man the boat all right. He does not have to man a boat—

Mr. SIMMONS. But the Senator says one boat. My position is not confined to one boat.

Mr. SMOOT. That is all we have heard of now.

Mr. SIMMONS. I simply used that as an illustration.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator from Utah does not wish to weaken a coast by taking a boat from that place and sending it to the North Carolina coast? He said this is a lump-sum appropriation and that Commodore Reynolds can order the boats wherever he pleases. He does not want to take it from Norfolk or from some place else in order to send it to the coast of North Carolina, surely.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not want to do that, but when I know that the service has been run for the present fiscal year with an appropriation of \$5,776,000 and that we have given a million dollars more in the pending bill it does seem to me that they could take care of the service. With that million dollar increase, if there is not enough provided and if there is this boat that could be put in service, I am willing to add \$50,000; but I think that is all the Senator ought to ask.

Mr. OVERMAN. I merely wish to say to the Senator from Utah in reference to this service that it is absolutely necessary in order to save property, to save life, to protect the coast from smuggling. As we know and have been informed, they are rushing in liquor in small boats through those inlets, and no revenue cutter is there to look out for them. This increased amount is absolutely necessary. Senators are bound to see that they can not get along without it, because they know that the Wilmington and Norfolk boats can not take care of that part of the coast.

I am glad my friend from Utah, who is very generous to the Coast Guard Service, I admit, and has done great work for them, is willing to give us \$50,000 for the boat which is tied up there that these men desire to use for this purpose. As to the other parts of the service I do not know. My colleague knows

about them, but I know that it is absolutely necessary that we police that great coast line there, the most dangerous in the world, as everybody knows and admits.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows we have already increased the amount a million dollars.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes; and the Senator from Utah admitted that we need a million dollars more. He knows that the service was crippled or he would not have given that much. I remember that the Senator went very deeply into the question of the payment of warrant officers and enlisted men, but the Senator did not go into this question because Commodore Reynolds was not there to testify about it. Therefore, this is newly discovered evidence so far as I am concerned, and that is the reason why I am differing with the committee and asking them to give us the additional money upon newly discovered evidence, that of the chief of the department, who, as the Senator from Utah said, is one of the best men in the Government service.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina, before he takes his seat, at what point on the coast line the smuggling to which he refers is taking place?

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not know. I am only told that there is a great deal of smuggling on that coast.

Mr. REED. There is apt to be something of a movement over to that coast since the Senator has made the admission.

Mr. OVERMAN. That may be; I do not know. I know there are charges that smuggling is going on along the coast and through those inlets, and the Coast Guard ought to be enabled to stop it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not wish at all to be misunderstood. My colleague is entirely right. While the testimony of Commodore Reynolds was given in the House hearings upon the points that I have brought out, it does not seem to have been presented to the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I wish briefly to repeat my statement.

This is not a one-boat proposition. I explained that at the time I referred to the *Pamlico* and the local situation along the North Carolina coast. I used the *Pamlico* merely as an illustration of the inadequate service that this arm of the Government is furnishing at this particular time, because it does not have sufficient money to hire men to constitute a crew for that particular boat.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] has laid stress upon the fact that the committee increased the appropriation over the House provision, and that the House increased the amount over the appropriation for the last fiscal year. It is true that the House committee did increase the appropriation over that for the last fiscal year, but here is what Commodore Reynolds said about that:

That is 2,885, I believe we have figured that out to be—

That is the number of enlisted men—

which would necessitate a reduction of about 900 between now and the 1st of July, which would mean that the next fiscal year we would have to close approximately half of our stations, formerly life-saving stations, and lay up more of our ships, and very seriously cripple us.

Mr. SMOOT. We did not cut them down to 2,500 men, though.

Mr. SIMMONS. The appropriation as increased by the other House, if it had remained at the figures fixed by the House, would have reduced the present force of enlisted men from three thousand seven hundred and fifty-one to two thousand eight hundred and eighty-odd or would have reduced the present force by 900 men, and that at a time when Commodore Reynolds said there were 35 of the ships belonging to the service, and which were needed in the service, lying up idle at the docks, rotting, and performing no service at all, because 3,751 men were not sufficient to man all of them or so many of them as he might urgently need in the service. That is what the House provision would have done. It would have reduced the present inadequate force by 900 men, although it increased the appropriation of last year. I have explained why the financial needs of the Coast Guard Service have increased as much as they have. Commodore Reynolds also explained it fully in his testimony before the House committee.

During the preceding year, when the appropriation was something over \$5,000,000, the force of enlisted men was constituted of sailors, trained men, efficient men. Commodore Reynolds said these trained men had retired, that they had gone out of his service, and that he had to recruit the present service from raw material, wherever he could find men, and that these new men have to be trained. He did not desire to mislead the committee, but he told the committee frankly that he had found he had to have two of these raw men to perform the work which formerly had been performed by one trained sailor.

That, together with the fact that all of these salaries were placed upon the Navy basis, increased the expenditures. However, the fact can not be ignored—and the Senator from Utah now concedes it—that with the increase which the Senator says the House made and for which he claims so much credit—

Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not claim any credit.

Mr. SIMMONS. He claims that it would help the service—with that increase, the service as now constituted, which the commander and officer in charge of the service says is inadequate, would have been cut down by 900 men. The Senator's committee—

Mr. SMOOT rose.

Mr. SIMMONS. Just a moment. The Senator's committee increased the appropriation by \$750,000, but when the figures are worked out as I have worked them out, and as they were worked out in the hearings before the committee, the increase in the appropriation of \$750,000 does not permit the addition to the enlisted force of a single man. So all that the Senator's committee has done is that it has provided an appropriation sufficient to pay for the legal salaries and to keep the force at the size it was last year.

That would be all right if it were not for the fact that the commander in charge of the service says that with that force many of his boats are idle, though they are very urgently needed in the service.

I am simply asking this, not that I may have one boat for North Carolina, but I am asking that we may have an additional appropriation of \$250,000, which would permit the commodore to employ the absolutely necessary additional men, enough probably to man 10 or 15 of these boats, possibly only 10 of them, and which would enable him to utilize wherever they are needed the ships which are now tied up. The ship of which I spoke, which was formerly stationed in North Carolina waters, is only one of them. The *Apache*, of which I spoke, which formerly did this work on Chesapeake Bay, is another one of them. Those are two of the best ships in the service.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIAL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CURBERSON], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. KIRBY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], I withhold my vote.

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FERNALD. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. Upon this question I am released from that pair, and therefore am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. REED. On a previous roll call I neglected to announce the absence at that time on official business of the Senate of the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. I desire to make that announcement now and let it go into the RECORD.

Mr. MYERS. I inquire if the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with that Senator, and in his absence withhold my vote.

Mr. DIAL. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr.

COLT] to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. MYERS. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS].

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 33, as follows:

#### YEAS—22.

Dial	Kirby	Robinson	Trammell
Gay	McKellar	Sheppard	Underwood
Glass	Overman	Simmons	Walsh, Mass.
Harris	Pittman	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Harrison	Ransdell	Smith, S. C.	
Heflin	Reed	Swanson	

#### NAYS—33.

Borah	Gooding	Lenroot	Spencer
Brandeggee	Gronna	Lodge	Sterling
Calder	Hale	McCumber	Sutherland
Capper	Jones, Wash.	McNary	Thomas
Curtis	Kellogg	Moses	Warren
Dillingham	Kenyon	Myers	Willis
Elkins	Keyes	New	
Fernald	King	Polindexter	
France	La Follette	Smoot	

#### NOT VOTING—41.

Ashurst	Gerry	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.
Ball	Gore	Newberry	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Henderson	Norris	Stanley
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Owen	Townsend
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Page	Wadsworth
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Walsh, Mont.
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelan	Watson
Edge	Kendrick	Phipps	Williams
Fall	Knox	Pomerene	
Fletcher	McCormick	Sherman	
Frelinghuysen	McLean	Shields	

So Mr. SIMMONS's amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 67, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "\$8,670,000," and to insert in lieu thereof "\$8,000,000," so that line 1 will read as follows:

Mississippi River, \$8,000,000.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I hope that amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. My understanding is that an amendment of a similar character was presented heretofore and passed upon by the Senate. In the light of that action, is another amendment permissible?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That was an amendment increasing the amount to \$10,000,000. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is in order.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not intend to take the time of the Senate to argue this question at any length. My reason for offering it is that on the last vote there was a tie, that vote being taken upon the amount of \$10,000,000 instead of this smaller sum; and I had in mind the thought that possibly some of the Members of the Senate who voted against the amount of \$10,000,000 might conclude that it is proper to vote for \$8,000,000.

The case has been presented by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] and others. The letter of the president of the Mississippi River Commission has been read into the RECORD and discloses the fact that this money is necessary, that the present appropriation is exhausted, and that if \$10,000,000 is not appropriated the Government work is liable to be swept away by the waters, to the great detriment and loss of the United States. There is no occasion for re-reading that letter. It presents the case as it is seen by the man who is in charge of the work.

Mr. President, every once in a while the Senate gets an economical fit, and cuts every appropriation and pares every proposition, and then in a few days it forgets all about the question of economy and appropriates sums of money with a reckless dis-



regard of the public interest. We seem to be having an economical spell to-day. There are two kinds of economy. One is a real economy, where you are cutting down expenses for things you can do without. The other is that kind of economy which undertakes to cut down expenses when the wise policy is to spend money in order to avoid greater losses. There is the kind of economy that leads a man not to put a new roof on his house when one is needed, permitting the house to go to ruin, when a few dollars would save it. There is the kind of economy, upon the other hand, that leads a man not to buy an automobile when he does not need it.

Mr. President, the first kind of economy that I spoke of is being practiced in this case. The Government has expended many million dollars in improving the Mississippi River; but those improvements are to-day incomplete, and until that project is completed every foot of it is endangered and is liable in many instances to be swept away, resulting in a loss of scores of thousands of dollars, and in some instances many millions of dollars. That being the case, it is mere wastefulness on the part of the Senate not to protect these works; and I appeal to the Senate to allow a sufficient amount of money to carry on the improvements that are now under way and to bring to the country the benefit of a completed project.

Mr. President, Senators are voting against this Mississippi River project who only a few months ago voted for an Army of over 300,000 men, well knowing that every day that Army was in existence it was a mere expense, and that, aside from an absolute necessity, its maintenance was unwarranted. The same Senators recently reduced their demands to 175,000. I look for a time when we shall have a proper regard for economy and that Army will be further reduced. Money spent for an army is money eaten up and destroyed and is wholly inexcusable unless the presence of the Army is necessary; but when you improve one of the great highways of this country you increase the wealth of the country; you make an investment which brings back a return. When you put water upon the arid lands of the West, that is not money wasted; it is an investment that brings back money. When you put money into levees or protect the levees of a great stream, and to protect the adjacent lands from floods, you have given to agriculture the benefit of that vast body of land which otherwise might be rendered worthless. Bonds floated or moneys voted for a project of that kind are in the nature of an investment, bringing back a return; and they have, as the actual figures will show, brought back a return many times the expenditure for every dollar that has ever been put out upon this great stream.

So far as I am concerned, I hope to see our Government pursue a wise, a broad, and a progressive policy with reference to the improvement of all our harbors and all our rivers and all our arid lands. Those projects bring back money. They do not result in money being wasted.

I appeal to the Senate not to jeopardize the work that has already been done and the money that has already been expended upon this great river and to allow this amendment to be agreed to.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, just a word in support of this amendment.

I was very sorry when, by a tie vote, the Senate declined to accept my amendment giving \$10,000,000, instead of \$6,670,000, for the prosecution of the work of the Mississippi River Commission on 1,571 miles of that great stream. It is a colossal work, as stated in my first speech here to-day. It takes a great deal of money. The commission needs the full \$10,000,000. It would be expended wisely. Not a dollar of it would be mispent. Every dollar would bring big returns, but the Senate has not given us the \$10,000,000. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] has offered an amendment raising the amount which the committee proposes to appropriate from \$6,670,000 to \$8,000,000. That is an addition of \$1,330,000. It would do a great deal of good. It would help very materially. I appeal to the Members of the Senate to vote in favor of this amendment. It certainly would be of immense help.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIAL (when his name was called). I transfer by pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], I withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBINSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] and vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERTSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. I am informed, however, that he would vote "nay" if he were present. I therefore feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] and withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], but I understand he would vote as I do, and I therefore feel at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Making the same announcement that I made on the last vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. FERNALD. Making the same announcement as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN];

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]; and

The Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY].

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 28, as follows:

#### YEAS—31.

Ashurst	Heflin	Robinson	Sutherland
Dial	Hitchcock	Sheppard	Swanson
Elkins	McKellar	Simmons	Trammell
Fletcher	McNary	Smith, Ga.	Underwood
Gay	Overman	Smith, S. C.	Walsh, Mass.
Gore	Pittman	Spencer	Williams
Harris	Ransdell	Stanley	Wolcott
Harrison	Reed	Sterling	

#### NAYS—28.

Ball	Dillingham	Kellogg	Nelson
Borah	Fernald	Kenyon	New
Brandegge	France	Keyes	Polindexter
Calder	Gooding	King	Smoot
Capper	Gronna	La Follette	Thomas
Colt	Hale	Lenroot	Warren
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Moses	Willis

#### NOT VOTING—37.

Beckham	Johnson, Calif.	Myers	Shields
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Newberry	Smith, Ariz.
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Smith, Md.
Cummins	Kendrick	Owen	Townsend
Edge	Kirby	Page	Wadsworth
Fall	Knox	Penrose	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Phelan	Watson
Gerry	McCormick	Phipps	
Glass	McCumber	Pomerene	
Henderson	McLean	Sherman	

So Mr. REED's amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote whereby the committee amendment on page 15, line 13, was agreed to was reconsidered for the purpose of enabling the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] to offer an amendment. The amendment to the amendment was rejected. So the question is now on the committee amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. I desire to offer another amendment to that paragraph.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in order.

Mr. SIMMONS. I move to amend, on page 15, line 13, by striking out "\$6,750,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$6,800,000," increasing the amount \$50,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to that amendment, so far as I am concerned.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I give notice that I shall reserve a vote in the Senate on the amendment relating to the Mississippi River Commission.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yesterday I offered an amendment, on page 14, after line 13, to authorize the use of some unused money appropriated for the purchase of a site for a customhouse at Wilmington for the purpose of purchasing a small strip lying alongside the new building. The Senator from Wyoming raised a point of order, and I ask him now if he will not withdraw the point of order.

Mr. WARREN. I have looked the matter up since yesterday, and, as the circumstances are rather peculiar, I shall no longer resist the amendment going into the bill. I am willing that the amendment shall be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 14, at the end of line 13, insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise certain additional land across the alley, which joins the east side or rear of the present site of the customhouse, appraisers' stores, etc., building at Wilmington, N. C., as an addition to said present site, and to pay for such additional land from the unencumbered balance of the appropriations heretofore made for the acquisition of a site and the erection of the customhouse, appraisers' stores, etc., building in said city.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to be inserted in the proper place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Insert at the proper place the following:

To enable the President to cause an investigation to be made as to the petroleum resources and the production of petroleum in other countries, \$35,000.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, of course the Senator knows a point of order could be made, but I do not propose to object, if the amendment is unanimously agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, yesterday I offered an amendment, on page 32, line 6. I want to give notice that I shall renew that amendment in the Senate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment, which I call to the attention of the chairman of the committee. It provides for the consolidation, at Alliance, Nebr., of the offices of register and receiver. I ask to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 82, line 2, after the numerals "\$450,000," insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That the President is authorized to consolidate the offices of register and receiver at Alliance, Nebr., and by Executive order to require either officer, upon resignation of the other, to give an additional bond and to perform the duties of both offices. All the powers, duties, obligations, and penalties imposed by law upon the register and receiver of said office shall be exercised by and imposed upon the officer remaining in control, whose compensation shall be a salary of \$500 per annum, together with the fees and commissions otherwise allowable to both the register and receiver; but the salary, fees, and commissions of such officer shall not exceed \$3,000 per annum.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, of course both of those offices are provided for in the legislative bill as it passed the House. The Senator from Nebraska has considered, I suppose, that if this be adopted we shall strike out of the legislative bill both of those offices; that is, as they are contained in the appropriation bill; or does he wish to have incorporated in the amendment the amount this one officer receives? I take it that the Senator does not provide for clerks.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I presume that change may be made in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. It is in the interest of economy, and the fees now do not warrant maintaining two offices.

Mr. WARREN. Of course, a point of order can be made against it, as it was not specifically estimated for. But I am loath to make the point on any proposition of this kind, which

has a precedent, and also is in the line of economy. I make no objection.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am heartily in favor of this proposition, but I want Vancouver and Seattle, Wash., inserted in the amendment at the proper place, and I move to amend the amendment to that effect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, after the word "Nebraska," insert the words "Vancouver, Wash., and Seattle, Wash.," so as to read:

Provided, That the President is authorized to consolidate the offices of register and receiver at Alliance, Nebr.; Vancouver, Wash.; and Seattle, Wash., and by Executive order to require either officer, upon resignation of the other, to give an additional bond—

And so forth.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to say in this connection that I think we ought to have a law under which that can be done all through the country.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, when we had under consideration the other day the appropriation for an archives building, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] offered an amendment, the object of which was to prevent, if I interpreted the amendment correctly, the utilization of a portion of an avenue for building purposes. With that amendment, the amendment offered to the bill by the committee was adopted. I gave notice at that time that I should call attention again to the matter, and I do so now.

I send to the desk an amendment which I offer as a substitute for the committee amendment as amended. I ask that the Secretary read the proposed substitute which I offer. I am asking to strike out the committee amendment as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before doing that, it will be necessary to reconsider the previous vote. Is there objection to reconsidering the vote whereby the committee amendment as amended was agreed to?

Mr. WARREN rose.

Mr. KING. I hope the chairman of the committee will not object. I had called attention to the matter at the time and stated—

Mr. WARREN. I will not object if the matter is to be taken up and voted on immediately.

Mr. KING. I am ready to take it up now and have it disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote whereby the amendment as amended was agreed to is reconsidered. The Senator from Utah offers a substitute, which will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

Washington (D. C.) Archives Building: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the provisions of section 21 of the public buildings act approved March 4, 1913, authorizing him to secure a site for an archives building, he is hereby authorized and directed to take over and appropriate for the uses of said archives building the block of land now owned by the Government, No. 230, according to the map and survey of the District of Columbia, and located between B and C Streets and Fourteenth and Fifteenth Streets NW., and to erect said building on said property. For the working drawings in accordance with the plans prepared by the Supervising Architect and approved as by law provided for said building, \$10,000.

Mr. WARREN. I desire to say that the chairman of the committee is not familiar with that particular lot nor with its present occupancy. I should like to know whether it is immediately adaptable and if there is any other governmental activity housed there?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can state to the chairman of the committee that I happen to be familiar with the ground, as I said the other day. This lot up to two years ago was used as a lumber yard. The Government bought it four or five years ago to build a State Department on it.

Mr. WARREN. This is a part of the area opposite the Treasury Building, the Willard Hotel and so forth?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The purchase of the Government started in at the theater on Pennsylvania Avenue opposite the New Willard and ran back to the Mall. This particular block is the block that lies next to the Mall, the one farthest away from Pennsylvania Avenue. There is a temporary building on it now that is being used by some of the clerks in the Internal Revenue Bureau. Of course there are vacant buildings here to which they can be shifted. It is a cheap building. My purpose in offering the amendment was to keep them from closing up Ohio Avenue, but if we are to work on the idea of economy, the Government owns the property and it undoubtedly will not for years build another building on it such as the State Department, which was contemplated when we bought



it. I am in favor of the amendment with the idea of economy, because this is a block just as big as the block provided for in the bill, and it will probably stay there for 20 years without being occupied. At 5 per cent interest that means 100 per cent at the end of 20 years, so that if we want to build an archives building we have now a more available block and in a better neighborhood.

Mr. WARREN. This is the block that is occupied entirely by the Internal Revenue Bureau building, that has pillars at the entrance on each side on Fifteenth and Fourteenth Streets?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know. There is a white 2-story building of cheap construction.

Mr. WARREN. A very large building?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; covering this very large block.

Mr. WARREN. Opening one way on Fourteenth Street and the other way on Fifteenth Street?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. What shall we do with the internal-revenue employees?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is a temporary building, and I do not see that it is worth while keeping them in that building and then to spend half a million dollars for the purchase of the other land. It is a far more available site, and in the interest of economy I think the archives building ought to be placed in that block.

Mr. WARREN. The location is all right.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The location is better.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Alabama has made such an admirable speech with reference to the matter that unless there is some opposition I shall not detain the Senate further.

Mr. POINDEXTER. This is the lot, I assume, which has been acquired by the Government for the purpose of erecting a commerce building?

Mr. KING. May I say to the Senator, if he will pardon me, that my understanding is that it was acquired years ago for the purpose of erecting a building for the Department of State, but in view of the fact, if I may further have the attention of the Senator, that the Navy Department and the War Department have removed most of their personnel to other buildings, it is quite evident that what is known as the State, War, and Navy Building will be sufficient for many years to come to house the State Department, so there will be no necessity for the utilization of the block to which the Senator is about to refer for such a purpose.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The buildings to which the Senator from Utah refers are temporary war buildings erected in a park with the understanding and with the purpose of removing them as soon as the exigencies of the war had ceased. They will not be available permanently for the use of the State Department or the Department of Commerce.

The lot to which the Senator has referred—I have before me a map furnished by the public grounds commission of the city—is designated as the Department of Commerce lot. It has been set apart for that purpose. At the present time it is occupied by a valuable building occupied by Government employees. Neither the Senator from Utah nor anyone else that I have heard has suggested where those Government employees will be housed if they are removed from the building upon this lot, nor have they suggested why a valuable building that is there in use should be torn down for the purpose of erecting another building on the lot.

Mr. KING. May I say to the Senator that I hope our Republican friends in the coming Congress will materially reduce the personnel in the Government service in Washington. It was charged by Republicans during the campaign, and I do not say this by way of criticism, that there were more than 40,000 clerks in Washington who were unnecessary, and the Republican Party pledged itself not only to a material reduction in the number of Federal employees, but also promised that there would be efficiency and economy in the administration of public affairs. I regret that there are no evidences in support of these pre-election promises. It is obvious that with the repeal of the excess-profits tax and as well as much of the war legislation must inevitably result in a great reduction in the number of Federal employees unless the Republican Party is blind to its responsibilities and becomes the ally of incompetency and extravagance. A proper reduction in the Internal Revenue Bureau, as well as other departments and executive and administrative agencies, will call for the vacation by clerks of a number of buildings now in service.

The Senator will recall that we have constructed a large building for the Internal Revenue Bureau opposite the Treasury; it houses hundreds of employees. Certainly that building

with such other accommodations as the Government has, there will be no necessity for the maintenance of the building now occupied by employees of the Internal Revenue Bureau for their use.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is just a deduction on the part of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I am assuming the Republican Party is going to do something in the matter of separating from the service thousands of unnecessary employees. And I am, of course, assuming that war legislation will be repealed, and the Revenue Bureau relieved from the operations of a revenue system which resulted from the war and in its administration necessarily calls for a great number of employees.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have no doubt the Republican Party is going to do that, and that after they have done that there will be still a lack of space for the housing of Government activities. Then, too, before the war the Government was renting tens of thousands of square feet of building space for the purpose of housing its activities, at enormous rentals. The Public Buildings Commission that was appointed by Congress reported upon that, and their report was read by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] a short time ago, in which was pointed out the enormous saving that the Government could effect if it constructed buildings for the ownership of the Government in which to house its activities instead of being compelled to rent them of private owners.

The lot that is covered by the amendment which was agreed to by the Senate for the purpose of constructing an archives building, which was also selected under the authority of the act of 1913, is a part of that property that lies south of Pennsylvania Avenue in the vicinity of the Post Office Department, the New National Museum, and the Public Market, which was marked out in the plans for the improvement and erection of a State Department building and for the future construction of public buildings for purchase by the Government.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, does not the Government now own that ground?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes; the Government acquired it for the purpose of erecting a Department of Commerce building.

Mr. NELSON. But the other site to which the Senator refers?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; the Government does not own that. The amendment adopted was for the purpose of acquiring it.

Mr. NELSON. Buying it?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. Why should the Government buy a lot of land when we have so many pieces of land there? South of the New Willard Hotel we have two or three blocks of property. Why should we go on and buy more in that part of the city?

Mr. SMOOT. The reason why the committee agreed to the amendment was because Congress had authorized the purchase of land for this purpose, and it is only carrying out existing law. I agree with what the Senator says about buying land when we have land already, but the building that is now on the land is housing a great many employees of the Government.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will yield to me further, it seems to me, in view of our financial condition and with all that property now owned by the Government, and I think there are three or four squares that we own in the neighborhood there, there is involved the question why we could not utilize some of that land instead of buying more. There has been too much buying of dead property in this city to help out real estate men. I am utterly opposed to it. I trust that the amendment of the junior Senator from Utah will be agreed to.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, when those squares were bought it was for the purpose of erecting buildings for the Department of Commerce and other departments. I hope we will not change those plans, because they are intended to beautify the city by the erection of buildings for the Department of Commerce and other departments.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Department of State.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes; the Department of State.

Mr. POINDEXTER. And the Department of Labor.

Mr. OVERMAN. And the Department of Labor, too. All that land was bought with that idea, and that was the reason why we purchased them at the time. I remember very well the consideration of the matter here. The reason why we bought those lots was for that particular purpose. To beautify the city we began to buy on the south side of the Avenue, and we bought this square to get rid of those old buildings down there. We ought to look at it with that purpose, to add beauty to the city, in mind. We ought to look forward to beautifying the city of Washington. We ought to buy all the land on the south

side of the Avenue and erect Government buildings there, so as to make Pennsylvania Avenue one of the greatest streets in any city in the world.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Minnesota that I think he has been in accord with the policy of the Government acquiring all the property on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. NELSON. Not at all. I have never had any such insane delusion.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That has been the general policy.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator from Washington will examine the old plats of the city of Washington, he will find that that whole area was formerly nothing but a swamp. The Tiber Creek ran down through that section. The Post Office building was erected in a swamp. It never should have been placed in its present location when we had enough higher and dry land in the city of Washington on which to erect it. I am informed that it was located there—I was not a Member of Congress at that time—to placate the owners of certain big newspapers in the city of Washington, who desired the building to be erected in front of their offices so that it would be convenient to them.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, at one time Congress created a commission of architects to prepare plans for the city of Washington, and most beautiful plans were prepared by them to carry out their ideas. Their plan was to acquire the land on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue, to tear down the old, unsightly buildings there, and to erect from time to time in their stead magnificent Government buildings for the entire length of the Avenue. If that had been done, instead of erecting the Interior Department Building in a remote locality it could have been erected on an Avenue site, and would have added very much to the beauty of the city.

Mr. NELSON. If Senators will allow me further, I desire to say that it has always been my opinion that the Department of Justice ought to be located here on Capitol Hill in proximity to the great Library of Congress, and also the law library, which could very well be housed in such a Department of Justice building. We do not want the law library away down town; we want it near by. We also want the Supreme Court near by. A new building for the Department of Justice should be erected and it should be sufficiently ample to accommodate the Supreme Court and the law library.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is not any site on Capitol Hill where such a building could be erected without buying property for it at a much higher valuation than that for which the property proposed to be purchased for an archives building may be bought.

Mr. NELSON. When I first came to Washington we had a nickname for that rusty corner of town, but it is sanctified now because the Government bought four or five blocks there, and the purpose is to sanctify some more of it by having the Government buy more of that land.

It would cost us more, perhaps, to purchase land on Capitol Hill for the purpose, but I have always thought that the Department of Justice, the Supreme Court, and the law library ought to be here opposite the Congressional Library, within reach of Congress. We do not wish to have to run downtown for our law books. We want the Supreme Court to be here, where it can live in the atmosphere of Congress and get some inspiration from Senators and Representatives. [Laughter.]

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I am very much in favor of erecting a new building for the Department of Justice; I will vote with the Senator from Minnesota to acquire some of this property to which he refers; and if he will take the leadership and secure the authority of law, the object that he has in view may be carried out, though I think he will find it a very difficult matter to get a sufficient number of Senators and Representatives to agree with him to appropriate the money for the purpose.

The property which has been designated by the commission which was created by law for the purpose of selecting a site is under an option by the Government at a price which is entirely reasonable, a price which is based upon the assessed valuation of two-thirds the real value, with one-third added to the estimate of two-thirds fixed by the assessor, making what is called the legal value of the property. It is much cheaper than any property that can be bought adjoining the Library of Congress or in the vicinity of that Library. I am in favor of a liberal policy in regard to the acquisition of necessary property and the construction of necessary buildings; but for the Senator from Minnesota and myself to be in favor of that is a very long way from carrying it out.

We have a piece of property here which has been selected under the authority of law; Congress passed the law and ap-

pointed a commission, and the commission has selected the property.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. May I ask the Senator from Washington a question?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am advised on direct authority that the commission named in the archives building bill did not select this property, but that some other commission than the one contemplated in the law to provide for the erection of an archives building made the selection.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am aware that the Vice President has stated that he did not know that the property was being selected. I do not know anything about that; all I know is that the Secretary of the Treasury has furnished me with a report, to which is attached the signatures of the members of the commission, in which this particular property is platted and designated. I know that the Secretary of the Treasury, who had the initial authority under the law of selecting the property to be submitted to the commission for their approval, did select it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand that the commission has not selected this property. The main object I had was to prevent the blocking of streets. I wish to remind the Senator that my amendment prohibiting the closing of Ohio Avenue has been adopted. I drove through that section yesterday morning. If the Senator will go down and look at it in connection with the amendment which was adopted at my suggestion on day before yesterday, providing that Ohio Avenue shall not be closed, he will find that the Government will have practically no available property left, because Ohio Avenue constitutes a large portion of the area on which it is proposed to erect the archives building. Ohio Avenue cuts through the block cater-cornered; it is about 200 feet wide; and it leaves merely a fringe on each side. On the basis of the Government closing Ohio Avenue the property will be sold at a very high price to the Government. If the Senator would go and look at the block he would find there are a few broken-down old factory buildings on it. It is in a very much less convenient location than the one on Fourteenth Street, which the amendment of the Senator from Utah suggests; and I can not see any reason in the world why the Fourteenth Street site should not be selected.

I believe we ought to have an archives building, but I see no reason why we should not utilize land already belonging to the Government, on which there is located only a temporary building, which was erected during war times, a building of the cheapest kind of construction, which, in any event, will be removed very soon. It is a good location; it is a better location than the one which the Senator from Washington has suggested.

The proposed archives building will, I have no doubt, be ornamental; it is not going to disfigure the appearance of this neighborhood. It will be very properly placed at the end of Fourteenth Street just above the entrance to the Mall. It is more adjacent to the Treasury Department, to the State, War, and Navy Departments, and to the Munitions Building, and to practically every department in Washington except the Post Office Department, than is the block of land the purchase of which the Senator is urging, and it will cost nothing. The Senator wants to spend \$496,000, nearly half a million dollars, while the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah eliminates that expense entirely.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the fact that there are old tumble-down buildings on this property is a great advantage to the Government in buying it, because if the buildings on the site were expensive ones, naturally the Government would have to pay for those expensive buildings. This property is obtainable at its present value with the old buildings on it, and the Government has an opportunity to get it at that value.

I do not know what the Senator's attitude is toward the general policy, which I have understood has been recognized by Congress, of improving that section of the city with Government buildings and acquiring property in that vicinity, removing tumble-down buildings and erecting in their place creditable public buildings.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator has overlooked the proposition to which I called his attention—that it is not possible to erect an archives building on the site proposed without closing Ohio Avenue, for Ohio Avenue constitutes a great portion of the land area on which it would be designed to erect the building. The Senate, however, has already determined—and properly determined—that Ohio Avenue shall not be closed. The amendment as it now stands provides that it shall not be closed. The amendment of the Senator from Utah offers an exceedingly available block as a site for the proposed archives building which will not necessitate the closing of Ohio Avenue,



whereas in the case of the committee amendment, unless Ohio Avenue is closed, the property is practically not available.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator from Alabama says that if we do not close Ohio Avenue there is no other property left. That is rather an exaggeration, to say the least.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I mean there is very little property left.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is all the property left that has been described in the plats. The plats show Ohio Avenue; they give its width and show the number of square feet in the remaining property. The valuation which has been referred to does not relate to Ohio Avenue; it relates to the remaining property which adjoins Ohio Avenue within the block.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But there will not be enough ground there, if Ohio Avenue is not closed, upon which to erect an archives building.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think very likely that is true; but Ohio Avenue, as was pointed out yesterday, has been already authorized to be closed one block farther east, and the Congress would have the privilege at any time in the future, if it became necessary, to rescind the action taken two days ago and again to order Ohio Avenue closed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is just what I am trying to point out to the Senator. The Senate has already determined by its vote that Ohio Avenue shall not be closed. If we spend half a million dollars to buy these broken-up pieces of blocks and the Congress still adheres to the proposition that it is not going to close Ohio Avenue, the Government will have nothing for its money.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I wish to ask my colleague a question on that very matter. I have been thinking about it somewhat since yesterday and expected to be able to look over the property myself, but I have not had an opportunity to do so. As I understand, Ohio Avenue cuts in two the block which it was intended to acquire for the site for the archives building. Originally it was proposed to vacate Ohio Avenue and make it a part of the ground upon which the building would be constructed. The Senate by its amendment prohibits the closing of Ohio Avenue; so I understand that leaves us with two portions of a block upon which to erect the proposed archives building. Those portions of the block are separated by a wide avenue. How could there be constructed such a building as is desired upon those two pieces of property with Ohio Avenue still in existence?

Mr. POINDEXTER. The only way it could be constructed would be by closing up that avenue, and that would be a matter subject to the control of Congress.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But we have expressly said that that shall not be done.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I voted against that part of the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But the majority seems to have voted for it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand that, so far as the present action is concerned; but it does not preclude Congress from taking future action.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I appreciate that; but upon the basis of the action of the Senate it would seem that if we allow it to stand we would get nowhere toward providing an archives building, because we have not the land upon which it could be properly constructed. That is what is worrying me about it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think the Senator is entirely right. We can take the property subject to the contingency of securing future action by Congress for the purpose of closing up Ohio Avenue; and if we do not secure that action, we can not erect an archives building on the site referred to; but we will have a property which, I think, is in line with the policy which has been generally recognized as a proper policy in the development of the city of Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am heartily in accord with that policy. I myself once introduced a resolution looking toward the condemnation and acquirement by the Government of all the property on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue. That was many years ago, and if action had been followed along that line, we would probably have obtained property a great deal cheaper, and had it now for use; but it hardly seems to me the wise thing for us to go on and buy these pieces of property when we have declared that we will not vacate Ohio Avenue.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a casual examination of the map showing the two lots proposed to be purchased and their relation to Ohio Avenue, and also showing the block owned by the Government and which my amendment names as the location of the archives building, will convince Senators of the impropriety of following the recommendation of the committee. As pointed out by the Senator from Alabama if Ohio Avenue is maintained

as a street—and it ought to be, permit me to say parenthetically—then it is obvious that the two little strips on either side of it, for which we are asked to pay nearly half a million of dollars, would be utterly unsuitable for an archives building. No building suitable for governmental purposes could be erected thereon, so that the Government would have on hand additional real estate but which would be of no benefit to it. Doubtless the purchase for \$490,000 of this property would be advantageous to the owners of the same. I have no doubt they would rejoice to get this large amount for two little strips of land.

Mr. President, it seems to me that there can be no arguments against this amendment, therefore I shall not take the time of the Senate to discuss that matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, of the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I give notice that I shall reoffer, when the bill is in the Senate, the amendments which I offered yesterday, one, at page 135, with reference to the establishment of aids to navigation and for the purchase of a site and equipping a lighthouse, and the other, at page 153, after line 24, for a marine biological station.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry of the chairman of the committee before I move to reconsider the action of the Senate in regard to the item on page 38, "Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board," the item of \$40,000 for expenses of the board, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

Mr. SMOOT. That is out entirely.

Mr. KING. I was absent from the Chamber at the time that action was taken. May I inquire of the Senator whether the remaining item, \$300,000, is out?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The \$300,000 item is in; the \$40,000 item is out.

Mr. SMOOT. It is under the heading of the Public Health Service.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is on another page of the bill.

Mr. KING. I refer now to the item of \$300,000 for assisting the States in protecting the military and naval forces of the United States, and so forth.

Mr. SMOOT. The \$300,000 has been transferred to the Public Health Service.

Mr. KING. Was that added to the appropriation in the very large sums carried by the bill for the Public Health Service?

Mr. SMOOT. It was.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I move to strike out the figure "3" and insert the figure "2."

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be necessary to reconsider the action on the amendment in order to do that.

Mr. KING. I ask that the action of the Senate on the amendment may be reconsidered for the purpose of tendering this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah moves that the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to may be reconsidered.

On a division, the motion was rejected.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, while that subject is before us, I desire to ask whether the Secretary has stricken out lines 16 and 17, which read:

In all, Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board, \$340,000.

I think that should be stricken out. If it has not been stricken out, I ask that the Secretary may strike it out; also, that he may correct the totals in all the items of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is stricken out; and, without objection, that order will be made.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, on page 28, line 9, I move to strike out "\$840,000," and to insert in lieu thereof "\$600,000," so that it will read:

For pay of all other employees (attendants, and so forth), \$600,000.

Before the motion is put, I wish to invite attention to the fact that the appropriations for the Public Health Service are stupendous; and, in addition to this item of \$840,000, many of the appropriations preceding it are larger. I do not understand the necessity of such a large sum in addition to the amounts carried in the other items in the bill for this Federal agency. Sooner or later the Government will realize the necessity of curbing the ambitious and projections of this service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it is manifest that this Republican Congress, supported by some Democrats, is determined that

there shall be no retrenchment, no reform, no economy. Confronted by a deficit of \$2,000,000,000, we continue in a most reckless manner to pass appropriation bills carrying amounts so vast that we can scarcely comprehend them. The spirit of economy is not here; there is no support given to any plan looking to real economy. Our motto is: "Spend and ask no questions."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator whether he has been present during the roll calls to-day in the Senate?

Mr. KING. I have; and have voted "nay" on these efforts to increase appropriations and "yea" in favor of reducing items reported by the committee.

Mr. LENROOT. Did the Senator find the votes to increase the appropriations on the Republican side or on the Democratic side?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I confess that I did not pay much attention to the side from which the votes for economy came. Senators will recall that during the time I have been in this body I have shown no favoritism in my criticisms of appropriations. I have denounced appropriations favored by my own party, and have not hesitated to condemn it when I believed it failed to observe economy. I know no party when it comes to these questions relating to the public welfare, and when matters of expenditures are involved. If Democrats support appropriations which I think unwise, I shall vote against them.

Mr. LENROOT. If the Senator will yield, that is true; and I want to say that the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], I think, were the only exceptions on the Democratic side all day long.

Mr. KING. I shall not trouble the Senate now to point out the virtuous Senators on either side, but will assume that all are.

I move, in line 13, page 28, to strike out "\$55,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$40,000." There is an opportunity for the saving of a few thousand dollars. It is so small a sum that my motion will probably be received with merriment.

It is foredoomed to defeat, as are all efforts to relieve the people from the burdens of taxation under which they struggle, but I offer the amendment notwithstanding the anticipated result.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KING. I move to strike out, on line 14, page 28, "\$135,000" and to insert "\$100,000," so that it will read:

For fuel, light, and water, \$100,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, on page 31, line 2, I move to strike out the figure "5" and insert the figure "3," so that, if amended, it will read:

In such emergency in the execution of any quarantine laws which may be then in force, \$800,000.

Permit me to state that large sums have been appropriated in preceding items for the Public Health Service, and it seems to me that \$300,000 for this item is adequate. We can save \$200,000. If it is not sufficient, and some epidemic should arise calling for Federal interposition, Congress will be in session, and further appropriations can be made.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator tell us to what page and line he refers?

Mr. KING. Page 31, line 2, where I move to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$300,000." I think the chairman of the committee ought to join with me in saving a few hundred thousand dollars, and I hope he will accept that amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I am not objecting to these amendments. I am allowing them all to go to a vote of the Senate without making any objection at all.

Mr. KING. The Senator does not object, but I fear he votes consistently against me.

Mr. WARREN. I shall say—perhaps I ought to say with some shame—that I have not voted at all on any one of these amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I move to strike out the entire item found in lines 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 on page 31. It is denominated:

Field investigations: For investigations of diseases of man and conditions influencing the propagation and spread thereof, including sanitation and sewage, and the pollution of navigable streams and lakes of the United States, including personal service, \$300,000.

Of course, the clause "including personal service" is the most important thing. It means the creation of new offices and the employment of a large number of new officials.

Mr. President, there is a determination upon the part of the Public Health Service to take charge of the health of the people of the United States, to go into the States, and to discharge the duties and responsibilities which belong to the citizens and to local communities. The thousands of doctors and other employees of the Public Health Service, not content with what might legitimately come within the scope of Federal activity, are seeking to enlarge their powers and their functions and their jurisdiction and their authority, and we find determined efforts made to enter the States and assume a paternal and bureaucratic guardianship over the people. There is a misconception of the power and authority of the General Government; it is becoming a veritable Frankenstein; individuals, local communities, and the States themselves are being devoured by this huge organism, whose appetite increases as its victories multiply. It is now proposed to have this Public Health Service look after our schools, local and State questions of sanitation, and the health of the individuals. There will be no place left under this oppressive federalism for the individual or the State. We are trying to Russianize this Republic, and govern the people by a lot of petty tyrants and officeholders, who sit at Washington and send out their orders and edicts, by a million agents, to all parts of the land. There must be a halt to this grasping determination of the Federal Government to take over the functions of the States.

The greatest need in this Republic to-day is a revival of the spirit of personal liberty and personal independence and a love of local self-government. We are cursed by bureaucracy and menaced by deadly usurpations of the Federal Government. We are ruled and oppressed by commissions and bureaus and the unnumbered governmental agencies. We are fettered and shackled by the orders and rules and regulations of the thousands of Federal boards and instrumentalities that afflict a long-suffering people. And it is getting worse, and with the increase in Federal power there seems to be a diminishing spirit of resistance to these usurpations. We bow the neck to this new tyrant and submit to a Government not known to the Constitution, of rules and regulations and administrative law. These Federal agencies promulgate rules and prescribe pains and penalties. They take over the police powers of the States and impose their authority upon individuals. I protest against these assaults upon the Republic and the rights and liberties of the people. Gov. Miller, of New York, recently said that we are putting crutches under the arms of the people, trying to make cripples of them, so that they will have no courage, no personal independence, no genuine American patriotism and individualism—essential to their success and to the perpetuity of this Nation. Congress is trying to make each State a ward of the Federal Government, a weak and useless organism, and to enervate the people. Both State and people are to be reduced to a flaccid and colloidal mass which can not function and which, if they are amenable to any force or influence, it will be such as comes from Washington and the agents of the powerful paternalistic agencies created by the General Government.

The item in this bill to which I am directing attention is in line with this policy of having the General Government perform local and State duties. It calls for the intrusion of the Federal Government into the States, to discharge obligations and responsibilities which rest upon the States alone. Mr. President, I call for a vote.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. I congratulate the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I thank the Senator. Does the Senator from Wyoming wish to continue?

Mr. WARREN. I do. I desire to have the bill passed to-day. There are only two or three items to come up in the Senate as a whole, and I think we have plenty of time to finish. We must get this bill into conference. We are ready to have it passed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I move to strike out—and this item is cognate to the one which we have just stricken out—the item found in lines 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20, on page 31, entitled "Rural sanitation," for special studies of, and demonstration work in, rural sanitation, including personal services, \$50,000. Of course, Mr. President, a portion of that is for the "operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles." We must have more Federal officials, some of whom have failed in other fields, and send them into the States, and look after "rural sanitation" and the health of the people. Mr. President, the people can take care of their own affairs. A self-respecting, vigorous people are not asking Congress to take care of them. Congress is endeavoring to corrupt the people, and



by appropriations to induce them to betray their States and sell their birthright for a mess of pottage.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator has observed, of course, that the States, in order to get the benefit of that, must put up an equal sum.

Mr. KING. Oh, yes; the States are being corrupted and debauched just as fast as Congress can do it, and we are sending out representatives from these departments to aid in the debauching process.

Only a few days ago one of the representatives of the Public Health Service came to me for letters of introduction to the governors of some of the Western States. He said they were not active enough in responding to the advances made by the Federal Government, and Federal officials must go into the States and carry on propaganda to induce them to match appropriations made by the Federal Government for the discharge of duties which pertain exclusively to the States and to the inhabitants thereof.

Mr. WARREN. Let it go to a vote.

Mr. KING. The Senators having voted affirmatively on the other proposition, to be consistent, they should vote with me on this.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for a division.

The Senate having divided,

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the division it is a tie vote. The Chair votes "aye," and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, on page 34, line 26, I move to strike out "\$30,000" and insert "\$20,000." That is an item for furniture, and so forth, for the Employees' Compensation Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been reduced to \$20,000.

Mr. KING. I was not here when that was done. I am entirely satisfied.

On page 39, lines 27 and 28, and on page 40, lines 1 to 10, inclusive, I move to strike out the item for continuing the work of the commission engaged in valuing the property of interstate railroads. It has been said by some who are entirely familiar with the Esch-Cummins bill that under its operations there was no necessity of continuing the work of appraising the railroads, and I move to strike out that item.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KING. On page 43, I move to strike out the figures "\$350,000" and insert "\$200,000." That is for expenses of the Shipping Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 43, line 16, strike out "\$350,000" and in lieu thereof insert "\$200,000."

Mr. KING. That organization has been so extravagant and wasteful, Mr. President, that I think the time for retrenchment is here.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I should like to have some reason for reducing this item for the Shipping Board. I know the Government has spent between three and a half and four billion dollars to build ships in this country, and I know that the Shipping Board has been trying very hard to sell some of those ships and to raise money with which to carry on the business. The committee has undoubtedly gone into this question, and, unless we have some better reason than the idea of a Senator who tells us it is wrong, I do not think we ought to agree to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am so encouraged by the manifestations of favor for economy upon the part of both the Republicans and Democrats that I am led to suggest another amendment.

On page 44, line 11, I move to strike out "\$55,000,000," the amount given to the Shipping Board, and insert in lieu thereof "\$30,000,000," so that it will read "\$30,000,000" instead of "\$55,000,000." I feel persuaded that if Senators would make a little investigation they would support my view. I call for a vote.

Mr. McCORMICK. May I ask the Senator why \$30,000,000, rather than \$25,000,000?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, from the investigations which I have made, I will say to Senators that that amount of money may be necessary to carry on a rather imperfect and improvident program which has been inaugurated.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have many more amendments to this extravagant bill, which ought to be considered and voted upon by the Senate. Many of the appropriations herein

can not be defended, in my opinion, and should be eliminated. But I appreciate, from the attitude of Senators, that any appeal for economy will be in vain. The bill is to be passed as now framed and no assaults will affect it. I appeal, however, to Senators that when the next appropriation bill comes before this body they join with those who believe in economies and in retrenchment and reduce it to such proportions as will be warranted by the condition of the Public Treasury. I do not know what is going to become of the country if this centralizing policy is continued and the Federal Treasury is regarded as inexhaustible and as the fountain from which is to flow a constant stream to water the fields and lives of the people and the States. If we do not return to the path of safety and economy, the future of the Republic is not assured. It is the duty of the party in power in the Congress to curb the ambitions of those who would convert this Nation into a socialistic State, and to apply the principles of morality and policies of economy in the administration of the affairs of the Government. If they fail, their day of triumph will soon end.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, on page 19, following the numerals on line 21, I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 19, line 21, after "\$33,000,000," insert:

*Provided, That no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be used for the payment of commutation of quarters, subsistence, and laundry, or quarters, heat and light, and longevity to any employee other than the commissioned medical officers provided for by statute.*

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certain amendments have been reserved for a separate vote. The question is on concurring in the amendments as to which a separate vote was not reserved in the Senate.

The amendments were concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the first amendment reserved.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The first amendment reserved was by the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] on page 11, the total sum in lines 12 and 13 under "Public buildings, operating expenses." The committee proposed and the Senate agreed to an amendment striking out "\$3,800,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$3,700,000."

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, this is for operating expenses of the public buildings. In the main it applies to the payment of wages of cleaners, engineers, mechanics, firemen, and other men and women employed to take care of the public buildings throughout the country.

This group of employees have not had their wages raised for over 20 years. I know that in New York we have laborers in the public buildings who are receiving \$720 a year and right alongside of them are post-office laborers receiving \$1,200. We have carpenters and painters and mechanics in different lines receiving 25 per cent less than laborers in other departments. The appropriation asked for will hardly pay the expenses of the department for the ensuing year.

The sum recommended by the committee is \$47,000 less than the present pay roll, and perhaps before another fiscal year it will be \$100,000 less than enough to meet the expenses, with the present salaries, when you come to consider the fact that we are constantly finishing new buildings. I ask that the Senate committee amendment be defeated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That was the only amendment reserved. The bill is in the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I reserved the right to offer in the Senate certain amendments which I proposed to the bill as in Committee of the Whole. I offer them again. On page 135, after line 16, I move to insert:

Purchasing site for and constructing and equipping a lighthouse depot for the seventh lighthouse district, \$250,000.  
Establishing and improving aids to navigation in Tampa Bay, Fla., \$17,500.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I offer the amendment to carry out the provisions of existing law. An act of Congress was passed June 5, 1920, providing for these extensions and this aid to navigation in Tampa Bay. Congress has determined that it ought to be built. I submit that it ought not to be in the power of the Committee on Appropriations to say

that Congress shall not do what it determined to do by denying the appropriation necessary to carry it out. That is the situation. Congress has determined absolutely to build this improvement and passed a law to that effect. Now comes along the Committee on Appropriations and say, "We will deny the appropriation to carry out the policy," in effect repealing by their action what Congress has formerly determined should be the law and the course to pursue.

Mr. WARREN. The House did not include that item, and the Senate committee found it with 27 or 28 others of similar nature and felt that they all ought to go over until next year. I am not going to oppose a vote being taken on it if it can be taken at once.

Mr. FLETCHER. I want to have the Senate understand the amendment. I relied on that last night and it did not work very well. I want the Senate to understand the situation. The report says:

The Lighthouse Service storehouse, wooden smithy, and wharf are on property belonging to the Treasury Department, which is situated in the midst of the United States naval station. The wooden storehouse and wharf, which are highly inflammable, are located between the Navy coal sheds and Piers A and B, one of each on each side, and are therefore in an unusually dirty location. The coal dust is practically always in motion, and when the coal conveyors are in operation it blows about in clouds. It finds its way into the depot keeper's quarters and into the storehouse, where the thousands of dollars' worth of property is stored, which it is impossible to keep clean. These coal sheds have been erected since the storehouse was built. Furthermore, there are frequently several Navy torpedo-boat destroyers lying along side at the Navy piers on each side of the depot wharf, which, in addition to causing a great deal of dirt, are a menace to the lighthouse tenders on account of collision. A new site and wharf are now urgently needed for the efficient and economical work of the district. The Navy Department has repeatedly urged the removal of this depot from its present location in the midst of the navy yard.

Then follows the recommendation of the department. I wish the committee would recognize the wisdom of allowing this item.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FLETCHER. I now offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 153, after line 24, insert: Marine biological station, Key West, Fla.: For the completion of the marine biological station at Key West, Fla., including the construction of buildings, purchase and installation of equipment, and improvement and protection of grounds, \$110,000.

Mr. WARREN. That is neither provided for by law nor estimated for.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is provided by law. The amendment carries out the provisions of existing law. The existing law provides for this station and the amendment is offered in pursuance of and for the purpose of carrying out existing law. Appropriation has been made heretofore.

Mr. SMOOT. It was estimated for, was it not?

Mr. FLETCHER. It was not estimated for this year. It has been previously estimated for. It is not in the estimate, but it is to carry out existing law, and that comes clearly within the rule. I insist that here is a situation where, in 1914, Congress provided for the station and put it on the condition that the location should be donated. The people got together and donated the site. They dug canals, built sea walls, spent \$20,000 of their own money, and donated the location to the Government. The Government then appropriated \$25,000 in 1916 to begin the work, and there the thing stopped.

Is it possible that the Committee on Appropriations will not allow this work to go on? They deny the appropriation when the law provides it and when everything has been done that would require it to be done. The people themselves have donated the site and gone into their pockets and built the sea walls.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be agreed to, so we can rush along and finish the bill to-night and take up the emergency tariff bill and pass it at a very early day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 24, insert after the committee amendment the following:

The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is hereby authorized, by and with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to sell or exchange in full or part payment for other sites in the same localities the premises now occupied by and in connection with the marine hospitals at St. Louis, Mo., and at Memphis, Tenn., or either of them, as in his judgment the public service may require.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. OVERMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

RECESS.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Has the unfinished business been laid before the Senate?

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand it was temporarily laid aside and that it retains its place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is true. It will not be displaced by a recess.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is the reason why I did not ask that it be laid before the Senate. I renew my motion that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, February 10, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 9, 1921.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., pastor of Calvary Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, Thy mercy is without measure, and the gates of Thy love are wide open. Pity us if we forget Thee. Write Thy law in all of our hearts, that it may become a simple rule of conduct.

Comfort the bereaved ones who are to-day in the vale of shadows of their sacred dead, and bear them through the troubled waters of their grief until the mysteries of the night are dissolved into the promises of the morning. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALL OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Davis, Minn.	Jacoway	Oliver
Ashbrook	Dempsey	James, Mich.	Overstreet
Ayres	Dent	Jones, Pa.	Padgett
Babka	Donovan	Kennedy, Iowa	Patterson
Baer	Doelling	Kincheloe	Phelan
Barkhead	Doremus	Kitchin	Porter
Barkley	Eagan	Layton	Radcliffe
Bell	Edmonds	Lee, Ga.	Rainey, Ala.
Benson	Ellsworth	Leibach	Rainey, Henry T.
Bland, Mo.	Emerson	Lufkin	Rainey, John W.
Bowling	Evans, Nev.	McCulloch	Ramsey
Brumbaugh	Fairfield	McDuffie	Randall, Calif.
Buchanan	Ferris	McGlennon	Reed, W. Va.
Burke	Focht	McKenzie	Riordan
Caldwell	Fordney	McKinstry	Rouse
Candler	Gallivan	McLane	Rowan
Caraway	Gandy	Maher	Sabath
Carew	Gard	Mann, S. C.	Sanders, Ind.
Casey	Goldfogle	Mead	Sanders, La.
Chindblom	Goodall	Minahan, N. J.	Sanders, N. Y.
Clark, Fla.	Goodwin, Ark.	Moon	Sanford
Classon	Gould	Mooney	Scully
Coady	Graham, Pa.	Moore, Va.	Small
Connally	Hamill	Morin	Smith, N. Y.
Costello	Harrison	Mudd	Snell
Crago	Hoey	Nelson, Wis.	Steagall
Crowther	Holland	Nicholls	Steele
Currie, Mich.	Houghton	Nolan	Stevenson
Dale	Howard	O'Connell	Stiness
Davey	Hull, Tenn.	O'Connor	Sullivan



Tillman  
Townner  
Vare  
Venable

Vestal  
Vinson  
Ward  
Watkins

Whaley  
Wilson, Ill.  
Wise  
Yates

Young, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and ninety-four Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

#### ELECTORAL VOTE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House communications from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, authentic copies of the certificates of the final ascertainment of the electors for President and Vice President elected at the election held on the 2d day of November, 1920, as transmitted to him by the governors of said States.

#### GENERAL DEFICIENCIES.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15962, the general deficiency appropriation bill. Pending that I move that general debate be limited to two hours and a half.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that general debate upon the general deficiency bill be limited to two hours and a half.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the general deficiency appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the general deficiency appropriation bill, with Mr. LONGWORTH in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I think it is generally agreed that freight rates must come down. The public is becoming thoroughly alive to that fact, and even the railroad owners themselves as well as their employees are beginning to realize it. The question, however, that is bothering is how it may be done. Before rates can be reduced operating expenses must come down, and in order to reduce the operating expenses, the wages of railroad employees must be reduced and the cost of coal and steel to the railways must come down. I think it will be generally admitted that the largest items of the operating expenses of the railroads consists of wages and the cost of coal and steel. It is unfair that these three items should remain out of proportion to the general readjusted prices of the country. The country is going through a difficult period and we can not have prosperity with a lopsided readjustment. I believe that any fair-minded man will admit that the rates which prevailed at the time the railroads were turned back to their owners in March, 1920, were too low for a period of such high prices and were insufficient to pay the operating expenses of the railroads plus a fair return to the capital invested. So it was inevitable that there should be an increase in freight and passenger rates. I do not wish to be understood as saying that the rates which were fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission were unreasonable at the time they were fixed, but conditions have changed very radically since then.

The fault of the present situation does not lie with the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Railroad Labor Board; nor does it lie with the railroads or their employees. That looks like a rather broad statement to make and will not be accepted by some, because naturally we like to find some one to make the goat. The situation has been brought about by changed conditions, which it would have been impossible for anyone to anticipate, and these changed conditions must be dealt with, and they can not be dealt with by a further increase in the rates to the public. The freight and passenger traffic already has all the burden, and more than it can bear. The regulatory commissions of the Government, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Railroad Labor Board, have responded to the needs of capital and labor during the period of inflation and mounting costs.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. In just a moment. It is the public's turn now. The pendulum has swung back the other way, and it has swung back with a vengeance so great that thousands of farmers and business men have been pushed to the verge of bankruptcy, and unless these regulatory commissions can regulate in the interest

of the public at the time that it is necessary for them to do so, then regulation is a failure, because a regulatory system that will only regulate in favor of capital and labor and not in the interest of the general public would be a failure and would have to be discarded. I am making no such accusation against the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Railroad Labor Board. I have no reason to believe they will fail to function in the public interest, now that the time is approaching when necessity demands that they do so.

When wheat was selling for more than \$2 per bushel and corn for \$1.75, and cattle and hogs in proportion, and cotton at 30 and 35 cents per pound, and cotton seed at \$60 per ton, and hay at \$25 per ton, these rates were not excessive. They were reasonable and fair enough. But cotton is no longer 30 and 35 cents per pound, but is dragging at one-third that price. Corn is no longer \$1.75 per bushel, but is selling in the principal markets at very much less than one-half that figure. Also wheat, cattle, hogs, wool, hay, and practically all raw products have undergone a radical decline. The freight rates, which were reasonable and in proportion during the high-price period, are no longer in proportion now. There must now be another readjustment, and this time it must be to a lower level.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does not the gentleman, in view of the fact of the large increases in freight rates, think that the percentage of tax in the revenue bill on freight and passenger rates ought to be reduced or ought to be repealed?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; I do. Now, it is quite clear in order for rates to be reduced, operating expenses must come down. The returns to the Interstate Commerce Commission since the new rates went into effect on September 1, 1920, show that the roads have earned under those rates less than 4 per cent per annum on their valuation of \$18,900,000,000, as fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, or less than an annual rate of \$750,000,000 per annum, which is at least \$200,000,000 less than in 1917, the year before they were taken over by the Government. Now, I know that it has been said by some labor leaders, and it has been stated frequently on the floor of the House by certain Members, that the Cummins-Esch bill amounted to a gigantic subsidy to the railroads. The figures of the Interstate Commerce Commission do not bear out that statement. The figures of the commission show that the net earnings to the roads in 1917, immediately before we took them over, were considerably over \$200,000,000 more than they now are under the rate of increase granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission, whereas the aggregate amount of wages paid railroad employees is nearly \$2,000,000,000 more than it was in 1917, when the roads were taken over by the Government. Part of this increase in wages was granted by the Government during Federal control and part of it by the Railroad Labor Board, which was set up under the Cummins-Esch law. Now, that does not bear out the statement that the Cummins-Esch bill amounted to a gigantic subsidy to the railroads. The fact that the net earnings of the companies are less and the earnings of the employees very much more seems to completely negative such a statement. On February 4 I requested the Bureau of Railway Economics to give me figures as to the aggregate amount paid out for railway wages in 1917 and in 1920, and here are the figures: In 1917 the aggregate amount of wages paid to the employees of railways in class 1 was \$1,739,482,142. The figures for 1920 are not yet complete, but they show by multiplying the first quarter for 1920, which is available and which was \$795,618,330, by the four quarters of the year that the aggregate expenditure for railway wages in 1920 will be approximately \$3,600,000,000. I say that those figures are arrived at by taking the first quarter which is available, \$795,618,330, and multiplying it by 4 and adding to that the \$400,000,000 which resulted from the wage increase in May, 1920. The May increase, on an annual basis, was about \$625,000,000, but only two-thirds of that amount was applicable to 1920, as the increase was in effect only for eight months, from May 1 to December 31. On this same basis unless distinct economies are put into effect in 1921 by a reduction of employees or changes in working regulations or reduction in basic wages, the aggregate amount of wages in this year of 1921 would not be less than \$3,800,000,000, as against \$1,739,482,142 in 1917.

Now, it must be apparent to all that a pay roll of such staggering proportions can not be maintained under these new and changed conditions. Regardless of the fact that most of us like to see high prices for farm products and high wages for all laboring men, it is conditions which we must face and deal with and it is evident that the business and agriculture of the country can not support such a heavy load at this time.

Mr. BLANTON. Many of the railroads claim that in order to drop the expense of many empty trains that they have been

operating that it is necessary to lay off at least 30 per cent or more of their employees, and the employees come and say that they shall not lay off one of them. What are we doing about it?

Mr. BLACK. Well, I do not wish to be diverted now to a discussion of that question. I have no information about that matter and I am trying to discuss matters which I have studied and investigated.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I will yield.

Mr. LAZARO. In the District of Columbia here we have a commission regulating passenger rates on the two street railway systems. It developed that one was prosperous and the other one was poor, and every time the poor one asks for a raise, which was granted because they had to get it in order to operate successfully, the other one got the benefit of it. I would like to ask the gentleman if that applies to the railroad system of the country?

Mr. BLACK. Well, if the gentleman will remember the Cummins-Esch bill provides that when a railroad gets beyond a 6 per cent earning capacity that a certain percentage of it is recaptured in the public interest and placed into a loan fund to be administered by the Interstate Commerce Commission and to be loaned on satisfactory security to the railroads which are less advantageously situated, and some of the large railroad owners were very much opposed to that proposition, and the gentleman will probably recall that some representatives of these larger roads filed briefs with the House Committee on Interstate Commerce against this provision. But it went into the bill all right and I think is a good provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLACK. May I ask for five additional minutes?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I will yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BLACK. Now, not only must the wages of railroad employees be reduced in order that freight rates may be reduced, but the price of coal and steel to the railroads is entirely too high. I have no doubt that there are some coal operators and steel manufacturers who take the position that it is no affair of the public what the railroads pay for coal and steel, but it is.

As to the price of steel rails, the Bureau of Railway Economics said in its letter to me of February 4, 1921:

We have no complete statistics on the price of steel rails to the railroads in 1917 and 1920. However, we think the price paid in 1917 was slightly above the standard market price of \$28 per ton. Perhaps in the neighborhood of \$30. While in 1920 the price varied from \$47 up to \$57 per ton.

We are very much interested in these prices. When it is considered that the courts of the country have held that public utilities are entitled to earn a reasonable dividend on their investment after the payment of necessary operating expenses, then it does become a very serious concern to the public that those operating expenses shall be reasonable and just. If there is no way to hold down operating expenses, then there is no way to hold down rates. But of course there is a way, so long as it is properly exercised.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield for just a short question?

Mr. BLACK. I do.

Mr. CARTER. Does not the gentleman think that fixing a dividend for the carriers tended to take from them a great incentive to reduce wages?

Mr. BLACK. The Cummins-Esch bill does not guarantee any dividends to any carrier beyond the six-month period, which has already expired. I am glad the gentleman called my attention to that feature, for while it diverts me from what I was saying I want to discuss the matter briefly. The statement has often been made and erroneously made that the Cummins-Esch bill now guarantees a dividend to the railroads. It does not do that. I think I can very quickly prove that it does not. Now, for example, the net earnings of the railroads for the United States for December last were about \$23,000,000—bear that in mind, you gentlemen who have criticized the Cummins-Esch bill, and have said that it guaranteed a dividend to the railroads—the net earnings of the roads in December were about \$23,000,000, which will be less than 2 per cent per annum on their aggregate value as fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and if there was a guaranty, then somebody would owe and pay the difference.

Now, will anybody contend that the Government of the United States is either legally or morally bound to pay the difference between the 2 per cent and the 6 per cent, which was prescribed as a rule of rate-making? As a matter of fact, the Esch-Cummins bill only prescribes a rule of rate making, and says to the commission, "You shall fix rates in the groups that you designate, which will yield in the aggregate 5½ per cent and

an additional one-half per cent under certain conditions to railroads when they are efficiently, honestly, and economically administered." That is what the bill provides on that subject. Only that and nothing more.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman has stated the situation exactly, as we all understand it. Some of us thought that a guaranty—

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman contend it is a guaranty?

Mr. CARTER. I think that question would take a long explanation, and I do not want to take up the gentleman's time. At least the gentleman in charge of the bill at the time on the floor, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch], admitted to the House that it was a guaranty.

Mr. BLACK. I believe he did do so, but in my judgment it was a very erroneous statement of the effect of the rule of rate making in the bill.

Mr. CARTER. Now, the question I asked was with relation to wages to employees, about which the gentleman was talking. The wages have been increased, according to the gentleman's own statement—

Mr. BLACK. About \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. CARTER. About \$2,000,000,000 under the Esch-Cummins bill?

Mr. BLACK. No; there was a considerable part of it under Government operation. The wage increases by the Railroad Labor Board under the Cummins-Esch bill, which were granted last summer, retroactive to May 1, 1920, amount in the aggregate to about \$625,000,000 per annum. The rest of the \$2,000,000,000 was under Government operation.

Mr. CARTER. So that there must be something in the statement that the railroads have not that incentive to reduce wages that they would have when they would not have a fixed dividend income.

Mr. BLACK. They had no power to reduce wages under Government operation, and probably have none now unless such wage reductions are made by the Railroad Labor Board.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLACK. I am sorry I can not have the time to discuss coal and steel further, but I will not ask for another extension of time, as I understand the time of the committee is all taken.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, when Congress convened on the 6th day of December last a stupendous task confronted it. In less than three months it was necessary for the Committee on Appropriations and Congress to consider and act upon estimates for appropriations for the next fiscal year aggregating over \$4,701,000,000. The House has now arrived at a place in the legislative program of this session where we can fairly estimate the expenditures for next year if the amounts agreed upon by the House shall not be greatly exceeded when the appropriation bills are finally enacted by Congress.

At the outset the Committee on Appropriations realized that it must inaugurate a broad general policy regarding appropriations for the next fiscal year if Congress was to reduce appropriations so that there might be a substantial reduction in taxation. The policy adopted provided for a minimum of new construction and to reduce estimates wherever a reduction could be made without the serious impairment of a necessary Government service. There are those who believe that the Government should embark upon new undertakings and new activities that will necessarily involve very large expenditures. There are many who believe that the practice of the Government of granting State aid for worthy projects ought to be very largely extended. The Committee on Appropriations has consistently urged Congress to refrain from embarking upon new services at this time and has opposed every effort to broaden or extend the Federal-aid provisions, for it has been forced to realize that the Government can meet its expenditures in but two practical ways; first, by levying taxes, and, second, by borrowing money. The taxes must come from the very people who pay taxes in their respective States. We certainly will not borrow money to engage in new enterprises; and the National Government ought not to tax the people of a State to carry on the very work which the State is authorized to do, and for which the local State and county governments have ample authority to lay local taxes.

At the beginning of this Congress the Committee on Appropriations commenced its work with very definite convictions. It realized that there could be no substantial reduction in taxation until there was a substantial reduction in appropriations. Using this premise as a starting point, it has during the past two years labored diligently to bring about a substantial reduction in expenditures in order that Congress might meet the demand for a reduction in taxation. This Congress, if it completes its work of appropriations, will have made appropriations for two fiscal years in all the departments of the Government, and for three fiscal years in most of the departments, eight of



the great supply bills for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, having failed to pass when Congress adjourned on the 4th of March, 1919.

In making the appropriations for the year ending June 30, 1920, Congress reduced the executive estimates by \$1,685,867,893.54, and for the year ending June 30, 1921, it reduced the executive estimates by \$1,812,417,650.39. After deducting all duplicate estimates in the two sessions, the total reduction made for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, aggregated more than \$2,710,000,000.

The total executive estimates submitted to Congress in December with requests for appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, aggregated more than \$4,701,000,000. We have now reached the point in our work on these appropriation bills where the results of the policy of economy adopted by Congress can be clearly seen. All of the appropriation bills have been reported to the House with the exception of the fortifications bill, and all of the bills have been acted upon by the House with the exception of the naval appropriation bill and the fortifications bill. How well the House has performed its work on the appropriation bills at this session of Congress is reflected in the following comparative statement:

*Statement giving the amounts estimated and the amounts recommended in the regular annual appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1922, as reported to the House by the Committee on Appropriations, and the increase or decrease in the bill as compared with the estimates.*

Bill.	Amount.	Estimates.	Increase (+) or decrease (—).
Agriculture.....	\$33,517,459.00	\$53,029,384.00	— \$19,511,925.00
Army.....	331,222,612.62	699,275,502.98	— 368,052,890.36
Diplomatic and consular.....	8,543,650.79	11,983,848.94	— 3,440,198.15
District of Columbia.....	19,842,012.99	25,039,044.99	— 5,197,032.00
Indian.....	9,305,880.00	11,989,703.67	— 2,683,823.67
Legislative, executive, and judicial.....	112,705,748.75	136,452,634.97	— 23,746,886.22
Navy.....	395,504,444.23	679,515,731.47	— 284,011,287.24
Pension.....	265,500,000.00	265,500,000.00	—
Post Office.....	573,964,721.00	585,406,902.00	— 11,442,181.00
River and harbor.....	15,250,000.00	57,114,915.00	— 41,864,915.00
Sundry civil.....	283,209,092.41	804,525,484.85	— 521,316,392.44
Fortification (bill not yet reported; estimated).....	14,000,000.00	35,676,533.66	— 21,676,533.66
Total.....	2,162,626,221.79	3,365,502,086.49	— 1,202,883,464.70
Permanent annual and indefinite appropriations.....	* 1,335,776,390.87	1,335,776,390.87	—
Total.....	3,498,402,582.66	4,701,288,477.36	— 1,202,883,464.70

\* Includes appropriation for the Military Academy, formerly carried in a separate bill.

\* Includes \$35,000,000 estimated for payment of increased compensation to certain employees (\$240 bonus).

The statement assumes that the fortifications bill will not exceed \$14,000,000, and I believe that figure will be found to be in excess rather than under the amount which that bill will carry. It is thus seen that while the total requests for money for next year aggregated \$4,701,288,477.36, the total amounts reported to the House by the Committee on Appropriations for all the services, including permanent and indefinite appropriations, and including \$35,000,000 for bonus to Government employees not estimated for by the departments, is \$3,498,402,582.66, or a reduction in the estimates of \$1,202,883,464.70. If these bills shall pass before Congress shall adjourn without substantial increases, this Congress will have reduced the executive estimates by an aggregate of almost \$4,000,000,000 for three fiscal years.

I hope these bills will pass before this Congress adjourns. [Applause.] These bills ought to pass before the adjournment on March 4, so that the Ways and Means Committee of the House can immediately know the task that is before it. That committee is now studying the question of revenue. It realizes that there must be some reduction in taxation, and that certain taxes which have become burdensome to all our people must be modified and other taxes repealed. That committee will sit during the recess of Congress, and we ought to pass the appropriation bills in the time that remains of this session, so that that committee can take up its work with intelligence. It will then know how much revenue must be raised, and it will be able to cut its goods according to its cloth. It has seemed to me that if we act with moderation and economy, if we keep the appropriations somewhere around \$3,500,000,000 for the next fiscal year, including the appropriations for the Postal Service, the work for the Ways and Means Committee and for the next Congress, so far as revenue laws are concerned, will be comparatively easy.

In this connection it is both interesting and instructive to consider where the money comes from with which to pay these tremendous expenses. Last year our receipts, broadly speaking, came from the following sources:

Customs (tariff duties).....	\$323,536,559.25
Income and excess profits taxes.....	3,356,936,003.60
Miscellaneous taxes.....	1,442,213,241.46
Miscellaneous receipts.....	981,728,633.32
Postal revenues.....	437,150,212.83
Total receipts, not including public debt.....	7,141,564,649.96

In the main, the miscellaneous taxes above referred to, aggregating \$1,442,213,241.46, were derived from the following sources:

Estates.....	\$103,635,563.24
Transportation.....	253,244,640.48
Beverages.....	197,332,105.84
Tobaccos, cigars, etc.....	295,809,855.44
Admissions, dues, etc.....	81,918,656.74
Manufacturers' excise taxes.....	268,469,978.44
Capital stock corporation tax.....	93,020,420.50
Stamps.....	84,847,827.49
Oil by pipe lines.....	8,420,405.03
Telephone, telephone, radio revenues.....	20,631,837.20

The miscellaneous receipts, aggregating \$981,728,633.32, are made up of a great many items, including profits on coinage, tax on circulation of national banks, interest on public debts, premium on war-risk insurance, interest on farm-loan bonds, Panama Canal tolls, Indian trust funds, and sale of Government property, including surplus military and naval supplies.

The picture of our national finances would not be complete if it did not show in a more general way the cost of the functions of government which are paid for out of the appropriations contained in the table to which I have just referred.

The following is a classification of the principal objects of disbursement, exclusive of the public debt, for the fiscal year 1920, from the general fund of the Treasury, and disbursements for the Postal Service from the postal revenues:

European food relief.....	\$93,236,117.80
Loans to foreign Governments.....	421,337,028.09
Wheat-guaranty fund.....	350,000,000.00
War Finance Corporation.....	150,000,000.00
Bureau of War Risk Insurance.....	* 74,888,559.30
Bureau of Pensions.....	214,621,763.43
Federal Board for Vocational Education, vocational rehabilitation of soldiers, sailors, etc.....	34,984,423.90
Federal control of telegraph and telephone systems.....	12,018,557.68
Federal control of carriers and expenses under the transportation act, 1920.....	1,038,614,961.18
Shipping Board.....	469,094,549.35
Expenses of loans.....	22,122,776.85
Interest on the public debt.....	1,024,024,440.02
Military Establishment and War Department, civil (exclusive of rivers and harbors).....	1,053,694,541.33
Naval Establishment and Navy Department.....	632,690,267.94

The total of the above items, due principally to expenses incident to past wars and to present national defense, is.....

Postal Service (including \$418,722,295.65 payable from the postal revenues and \$35,698,400 payable from the Treasury) and Post Office Department (\$2,680,470.81 payable from the Treasury).....	5,591,327,926.87
All other disbursements of the Government, including the Legislative Establishment and the Departments of State, Treasury, Justice, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, and Interior, the independent offices, the District of Columbia, and miscellaneous offices.....	457,101,165.86
Grand total for disbursements.....	* 512,038,442.40

Since the signing of the armistice large sums have been disbursed in the payments for war supplies and materials, and in the carrying out as well as in the cancellation of contracts made during the war. The task imposed upon the War and Navy Departments, the Shipping Board, and Emergency Fleet Corporation, and the Treasury Department especially, was very great. But this war hang over, so far as accounts payable are concerned, is largely behind us. Looking at the matter in a broad way, it has seemed to me that if we do not by additional legislation take on new obligations in the way of financing activities heretofore financed by individuals or corporations, and if we do not take on additional Government functions involving large expenditures, we should be able to keep the appropriations within approximately \$3,500,000,000. An analysis of the receipts under the war revenue act will, I believe, show that by the repeal of the excess-profits tax there will come into the Treasury under the income-tax provision alone \$1,500,000,000 a year. My own opinion is that it will exceed rather than fall below that sum. Unquestionably the excess-profits tax is in a large measure passed on to the consumer, and is one of the elements that have tended to keep living costs excessively high. That tax can be repealed, and it ought to be repealed. It must be repealed if living costs are to be reduced in accordance with the demands of the consuming public.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. I will yield for a question.

\* Net disbursements.

\* This sum includes many minor objects of disbursement due directly to war purposes which are not readily susceptible of classification under that general head.

Mr. DOWELL. This is a deficiency bill. Will the gentleman explain to the House if it is possible in the regular appropriation bills to make appropriations that will not be exceeded by the departments, and therefore make deficiency bills unnecessary?

Mr. GOOD. Of course, deficiency bills should be avoided. They arise in three practical ways: First, by Congress enacting legislation subsequent to the enactment of an appropriation; second, by the happening of an unforeseen circumstance; and, third, by lax administration and violation of the antideficiency laws. We always have had deficiency bills; we always will have them. I hope we will never be called upon to pass another so large as this one.

It has been stated in the papers that our customs receipts or tariff duties can be raised so that we may expect \$500,000,000 a year from that source alone. I doubt very much if our tariff laws can be so modified that they will yield so large a sum. But I do believe that these laws can be revised so that we may expect as much as \$400,000,000 per year.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I am very much interested in the statement of the gentleman about the repeal of the excess-profits tax. Where would the gentleman get taxes that would take the place of these excess-profits taxes?

Mr. GOOD. We will not need the revenue brought in by excess-profits taxes if we will cut down appropriations. There is where we can effect a saving. We can avoid the payment of that tax or a substitute tax by a system of economy and national financing of temporary loans, such as our certificates of indebtedness, war savings stamps, and the Victory loans. There will mature within the next three years certificates of indebtedness, war savings stamps, and Liberty bonds of approximately \$7,000,000,000. Shall we continue to lay this heavy tax upon American industry so as to pay this indebtedness within the next three years, or shall we refinance these obligations by loans rather than by taxes? I believe our taxes have become such a load upon industry that they are harmful when viewed from the standpoint of national production, and that these maturing obligations can best be met by borrowing the money with which to pay them.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I very much fear that the gentleman's party will place a sales tax to take the place of the excess-profits tax.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman's party is so foolish as to place a sales tax on the backs of the American people, it will in his opinion go down to a humiliating defeat, because the people of the United States will not, in his opinion, stand that kind of a tax. [Applause.] A sales tax should be the last resort. During the next few years we will go through an era of great unemployment and social unrest. The man who does not realize that fails to read the signs of the times.

How will the laboring man feel, while out of employment and with a small or with scarcely no income, if he is compelled to pay a tax on everything that he eats and everything that he wears? Not realizing that the excess-profits tax has been passed on to the consumer and that in the past he has been compelled indirectly to pay it, he will become bitter in his resentment at a Congress that repealed a tax required out of excess of earnings only to substitute a direct-consumption tax, which he must pay. Our cost of the great World War must necessarily be paid by the man who has the money or property with which to pay taxes. That cost must be paid, not by a tax exacted from a man because he is hungry or cold, but from a man who has the money with which to pay the tax, and who can pay it with a minimum of hardship. Congress must keep clearly in mind the fact that all taxation must be fair and just, and that in levying new taxes great care should be exercised not to unduly antagonize the man who earns his living by the sweat of his brow. To unduly antagonize labor at this time, when there is so much unrest and when the army of unemployed is increasing so rapidly, might result in disaster.

To recur to what I was discussing, our money with which to pay the cost of government for the next year should, it seems to me, come from the following sources:

Customs	\$400,000,000
Income and corporation taxes	1,500,000,000
Miscellaneous taxes	1,250,000,000
Miscellaneous receipts (not including interest on foreign loans)	500,000,000
Postal revenue	500,000,000
Total estimated revenue	4,150,000,000
Total bills as reported, including \$14,000,000 for fortifications	3,498,402,582

It will be seen that this leaves a balance of the estimated revenue, over the reported appropriations, of \$651,000,000.

It has seemed to me that we ought to repeal the tax on transportation, which last year yielded more than \$252,000,000 in taxes on freight and passenger fares. That service is already taxed to the breaking point and these taxes should be repealed. It will not be difficult to find new miscellaneous sources of taxation that would not be burdensome to take their place.

Last year there was taken from bonded warehouses almost 40,000,000 gallons of spirits. These spirits paid a tax of only \$2.20 a gallon. They were withdrawn for medicinal purposes, but were used for beverage purposes. We ought to restore the tax of \$6.40 a gallon, and by so doing could add to our revenue from this source alone from \$50,000,000 to \$100,000,000, depending upon the amount of the withdrawals.

We have also a comparatively light tax on tobaccos, cigars, and cigarettes compared with similar tax levied in other countries. Last year we collected approximately \$295,000,000 from this source. If we levied the same tax on this class of commodity that is levied by Great Britain, and assuming that that tax would not materially interfere with the consumption, it would bring into the Treasury more than \$500,000,000 a year.

So that by repealing taxes on transportation we may find other subjects of taxation, by putting an additional tax on luxuries, that will more than take its place, so far as the revenue derived is concerned.

Again, we have in the United States more than 8,000,000 passenger-carrying automobiles. Practically every one is a luxury, and if we placed a tax upon passenger-carrying vehicles and made the amount of the tax dependent upon the horsepower, a reasonable tax, we could easily collect \$200,000,000 from that source. By pending legislation it is proposed to appropriate \$100,000,000 for so-called Federal aid for road building throughout the United States. No one is more vitally interested in good roads than the man who drives an automobile. By levying a wheel tax that would yield \$200,000,000 a year we could continue Federal aid for good roads at the rate of \$100,000,000 a year and still leave available for other Government functions \$100,000,000 derived from that source.

It is estimated that next year the postal receipts will bring in \$500,000,000 and that the miscellaneous receipts will yield \$500,000,000 more. During the past two years the Government has sold a great deal of property, real estate, buildings, and equipment of all kinds, and we have more to sell. We have also sold and will, I hope, continue to sell many of the merchant ships that we acquired during the war. Certainly the miscellaneous receipts will not fall far, if any, below \$500,000,000 a year. From these sources alone, therefore, we can foresee an income of not less than \$4,150,000,000 a year, which is \$650,000,000 in excess of the appropriations as carried by the bills as they were reported to the House. And these bills in the main have not been increased on the floor of the House. I hope they will not be materially increased in the Senate.

The changes in the bills thus far considered by the House from the bills introduced and referred to the House for action have been as follows:

*Comparative statement giving the amounts recommended in the regular annual appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1922, as reported to the House by the Committee on Appropriations, and the amount carried in the bills when passed by the House, showing the increase or decrease in the bill compared with amount recommended.*

Bill.	Reported to House.	Passed House.	Increase (+) or decrease (-).
Agriculture	\$33,517,459.00	\$33,668,009.00	+ \$150,550.00
Army	1,331,222,612.62	331,208,112.62	- 1,000,014,500.00
Diplomatic and consular	8,543,650.79	8,409,492.79	- 134,158.00
District of Columbia	19,842,012.99	19,807,012.99	- 35,000.00
Indian	9,305,880.00	8,576,390.00	- 729,500.00
Legislative, executive, and judicial	112,705,748.75	109,781,488.75	- 2,924,260.00
Navy	395,504,444.23	(?)	
Pension	265,500,000.00	265,500,000.00	
Post Office	573,964,721.00	572,714,721.00	- 1,250,000.00
River and harbor	15,250,000.00	15,250,000.00	
Sundry civil	383,269,692.41	382,483,692.41	- 786,000.00
Fortification (bill not yet reported)			

<sup>1</sup> Includes appropriation for the Military Academy, formerly carried in a separate bill.

<sup>2</sup> Bill now pending in the House.

It appears, therefore, at this time, if we can pass the appropriation bills as we ought to pass them, the next Congress will be able to take up the work of revenue legislation with intelligence. It will know immediately when Congress adjourns how much money we will have to raise to pay the expenses of the Government, and I believe the Committee on Ways and Means of the House can, in the next Congress, be trusted to bring in a



bill that will raise that revenue and at the same time repeal these objectionable and burdensome taxes that have contributed so much to make living costs excessively high.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield for a question.

Mr. TOWNER. Might not some of the \$600,000,000 be added to the revenue of the United States as interest on our foreign loans when we receive interest from the foreign governments?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; that could be done; but as and when interest is received from that source the amount might well be used for the retirement of bonds that were sold in the United States to raise the money needed to make these loans. In my remarks I have left out of consideration altogether the matter of collecting interest from foreign creditors. It is difficult to say at this time how the governments that were allied with us in the war and to whom we have loaned large sums of money will be able to finance their indebtedness. It is difficult to say with any degree of certainty whether they will be able to pay the interest on their obligations or not in the near future.

But from the sources I have indicated, with but \$1,500,000,000 of income taxes, as compared with \$4,000,000,000 collected last year, it seems to me that we can from these other sources derive sufficient funds with which to pay the cost of government. This means a reduction of 70 per cent in the income and excess-profits taxes, and that reduction ought to bring substantial relief not only to the taxpayer but to the producer as well.

One of the things that we most need in America to-day is increased production. Practically every business concern, be it great or small, is hampered to-day because of a lack of capital. When we require that so large a portion of the earnings of industry shall be paid in taxes, we leave but little available for the growth and expansion of business. If by the repeal of the excess-profits tax we can permit American industry to keep a greater portion of their earnings to take care of their increased capital demands, we shall in a broad and constructive way do much for the upbuilding of a bigger and better industrial America. [Applause.]

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman has stated that the postal receipts are about \$500,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. No; I have given the amount of the postal receipts for last year as \$437,150,212.33, but it is estimated that for the next fiscal year the postal receipts will yield approximately \$500,000,000.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman is aware of the fact that that is not equal to the disbursements?

Mr. GOOD. No; there will likely be a deficit of from \$80,000,000 to \$75,000,000.

Mr. STEENERSON. Closer on to \$100,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. I would not be surprised if the deficit would amount to the sum indicated.

Mr. STEENERSON. And the gentleman is aware of the fact that ordinarily the Committee on Ways and Means does not frame any laws to provide revenues for that service.

Mr. GOOD. Well, in a broad way, they are supposed to report a revenue measure that will yield enough to take care of all ordinary demands, including any deficit in the Postal Service.

Mr. STEENERSON. The rates are usually imposed upon the recommendations of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and it also depends largely on the action of Congress. Last year Congress increased the pay of employees in the Postal Service, and by that increase I am advised we have added to the postal expenditures for this year something like \$80,000,000.

Mr. STEENERSON. That was absolutely necessary.

Mr. GOOD. I do not think it was all necessary. Many of the increases were justified. But the committee has found this situation: Carpenters, plumbers, and mechanics employed by the Treasury Department are working in post-office buildings side by side with similar mechanics employed by the Post Office Department. In the latter case the employees receive as much as 40 or 50 per cent more than the wages paid to similar employees of the Treasury Department. We certainly do need a standardized wage in all of these services, where men are doing similar work, and my observation has been that some of the increases made in the Post Office appropriation bill can not be justified.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman ought to be aware that the complaints from these people in the employ of the Treasury Department are of long standing, and in the opinion of the Post Office Committee the employees did not render as good

service if they were reduced to the pittance that is paid some of these custodians of the Treasury Department who have charge of these buildings.

Mr. GOOD. I now desire to discuss briefly the items contained in this bill. Frankly, I do not believe I ever had charge of a bill that was as objectionable as the bill we are now considering. It contains items providing for expenditures in so many instances where I think the expenditure might have been avoided. The total estimates considered by the committee in the preparation of this bill aggregated more than \$478,000,000. The bill carries \$203,293,476.72, and is \$275,433,309.60 less than the estimates considered by the committee. The amounts carried in the bill, in a broad way, fall into seven general classes, as follows:

Internal Revenue	\$9,000,000.00
Military Establishment	48,000,000.00
Naval Establishment	61,500,000.00
Postal Service	57,000,000.00
Audited claims	16,000,000.00
Judgments	1,000,000.00
Miscellaneous, aggregating	10,000,000.00

The miscellaneous items include:

Interstate Commerce Commission	\$1,532,400.00
Public Health Service	1,514,280.00
Coast Guard	1,405,000.00
National Soldiers' Homes	610,000.00
Pension Office, examining surgeons	400,000.00
Department of Justice	1,325,836.96
Agriculture:	
Forest fires	725,000.00
Gypsy moth	150,000.00
Pink boll weevil	75,000.00
Lighthouse Service	351,362.85
Small miscellaneous	1,948,000.00

A brief examination of each of these classes will show the necessity for appropriations. In the first place, the Internal Revenue Department found that \$21,000,000, carried in this year's appropriation for conducting the income and excess-profits tax divisions, was not sufficient. The department found that it was necessary to do more work connected with the 1917 returns than they had anticipated, and that unless these assessments were made before the 1st of March, 1921, the Government could not make the assessments but would be compelled to bring suit to collect the taxes. The burden of proof would thus shift from the taxpayer to the Government and the incidental cost of making the collections would be very materially increased. They are now collecting from the 1917 and 1918 returns approximately \$35,000,000 per month.

Shortly after the 1st of July the Secretary of the Treasury found that he would not be able to place on the assessment rolls all of the assessments that ought to be made for the year 1917 before the 1st of March, unless he very largely augmented his force. He therefore waived the requirements of law as he was authorized to do, so far as an allotment was concerned, and employed an increased force, thus anticipating a deficiency. The Secretary asked for a deficiency of \$9,000,000. We have cut that estimate to \$8,000,000. That cut was made on the theory that inasmuch as the appropriation for next year is but \$30,000,000, if this year's appropriation was increased by as much as \$9,000,000 he would have a larger force during the latter part of this year than he can employ out of his appropriation for next year. In stating the appropriation for next year I am assuming that the Senate will agree to the provisions of the House bill. If it does not, then it will, I assume, make changes in our appropriations contained in this bill to correspond with changes it makes in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill in this respect, for the force employed practically during the month of June, 1921, ought to be maintained for the month of July, 1921. I do not know whether we have given the Secretary of the Treasury all the money he needs for this service or not; but I believe we have. I hope we have, for no one, I am sure, will say that we should not give the Treasury Department a sufficient fund to collect these taxes.

I do not know whether the entire force in the Internal Revenue Department is efficient or not. No one can tell. I believe it is headed by a very capable and efficient commissioner. It has been necessary during the last two years to build up a great force. To do this work efficiently requires trained auditors, and one of the things that has very greatly hampered the work is that large concerns, in dealing with the Treasury Department, discover auditors in the income-tax division, for example, doing efficient work, and they offer them more money to enter private employment, and of course they leave the Government service, and the Government is compelled to train new men to take their place. Because of this interference it has been necessary all along continuously to take on new recruits from time to time, and when it is necessary for a department to continually break in new men to take the places of trained and experienced men,

the cost incident to these changes is considerable, and the efficiency is not always the best.

Then the department asked \$1,600,000 for the enforcement of prohibition. They have available for this purpose, and for the enforcement of the narcotic act, \$5,500,000 for this year, and we are giving them \$1,000,000 more. Members of the Committee on Appropriations have been wrongfully accused for their failure at all times to appropriate all that has been asked for the enforcement of national prohibition. Personally, I care nothing about the charge or insinuation that the committee is wet because it fails to report all that is requested. A very large majority of the committee voted for the constitutional amendment and for the Volstead Act, but simply because we voted for it did not mean that we are willing to turn the Treasury over to those who are intrusted with the enforcement of the act irrespective of the needs of the service. When we came to this item we looked into it with the same scrutiny and care that we investigated every other item; and we finally concluded that by giving them \$1,000,000 we would be giving them a force with which they ought to be able to adequately administer and enforce this law, so far as the enforcement during this year can be carried on by Federal authorities. An examination of the hearings will show that there is in this bureau a force, with salaries, as follows:

11 supervising field agents, at \$4,727-----	\$51,999
44 directors, at \$3,932-----	173,000
206 clerks in offices of directors, at \$1,287-----	385,100
215 inspectors, at \$2,054-----	441,610
143 clerks in office of supervising field agents, at \$1,306-----	186,158
1,067 agents and inspectors, at \$1,728-----	1,843,796
450 guards at warehouses, at \$1,501-----	675,450
2,071 bonus employees—bonus paid to them-----	490,040
Travel expenses, annual-----	1,407,928
Total-----	5,655,081
Travel expenses for 5 months-----	586,218

While I have included the bonus as \$490,040 in this statement, it must be remembered that the bonus is not included in the appropriation of \$5,500,000, but is in addition to that amount. So that for this fiscal year, with the amount carried in the bill, we will have appropriated for the enforcement of the national prohibition act and the narcotics act, including the amount paid for bonuses, \$6,990,400. I resent with all the force at my command the insinuation or charge made by paid lobbyists that the Committee on Appropriations is not in sympathy with the enforcement of the prohibition act.

I do not believe that Mr. Williams's administration of the prohibition law is on a par with his splendid service with regard to income taxes and the other work of his department. And in saying that I do not want to be understood as saying that he is not doing his very best to enforce the law. I realize that he can not give personal attention to all of the details of the rapidly increasing activities of the office of Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The enforcement of the prohibition act was thrown upon his office at a time when he was already overcrowded with work, and the enforcement of that act was, I imagine, very largely left to other administrative officials. That I think was necessary. I do not believe that those who have been intrusted by him with the enforcement of this law have spent the appropriation with that same degree of care that has characterized the expenditures for the collection of internal-revenue taxes. I realize that it was a new law and everything connected with its administration and enforcement was new and that an entire new force had been rapidly called together to administer it. I have discovered some things to which I have called the commissioner's attention, and which he has promised to investigate, that ought not to exist.

For example, I discovered that in a town of approximately 50,000 people there was no officer stationed to enforce the prohibition law. But at a small place, within 15 or 20 miles of that town, where there never had been a saloon, a prohibition officer was stationed to enforce the law. This officer had never been in a small town and it was not contemplated that he would go there. But by designating the small town as his place of duty he would while engaged at work in the large town where he remained all the time be able to draw a per diem of not less than \$4 per day or actual expense not in excess of \$5 per day. Here, it seemed to me, was not only a case of maladministration, but was a case where an officer who was intrusted to enforce the law started out with the idea that in order to increase his pay he must violate the law.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield just for a question.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Has the gentleman any information outside of the one instance where that has been done?

Mr. GOOD. Having found it in one case, and having found where they are doing it in one congressional district, I assume that that is not the exception.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. And still it is absolutely denied in the hearings.

Mr. GOOD. No; it is not. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Williams, a man of very high character and splendid attainments, said he did not know about it but would inquire into it. He agreed with the committee that if that condition existed, it was an abuse that ought not to exist, and that he would see to it that it was corrected. And I have no doubt but that he will.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Let me tell the gentleman this: I went to see Mr. Kramer in reference to it—

Mr. GOOD. Why did not he come before our committee?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. And he absolutely denied that it is true.

Mr. GOOD. That shows that he does not know about the business with which he has been intrusted.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I think you do not know what your business is, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. GOOD. That may be true, but that is beside the question. A lady of very high standing in my own town, who for a great many years has given her time to the question of prohibition, called upon me while I was at home during a short vacation to tell me about some of these things. I made a personal investigation. I found there was no agent stationed at Cedar Rapids, a town of 45,000 people. About 22 miles east, at Lisbon, there was stationed a prohibition officer or agent. I was reliably informed that he had never lived at that place, that most of his time was being spent at Cedar Rapids, and while there he was drawing his per diem at not less than \$4 per day. I was also advised that another prohibition officer or agent was stationed at Vinton, a town about 40 miles northwest of Cedar Rapids, and that this agent did not live at Vinton but spent his time in larger cities, and while away from his official designated place of duty drew his per diem. If either of these agents had been stationed in the large city in which they performed their work, they would not have been entitled to any expense while at work at the place officially designated as their place of duty. Just think of it; here is a great force costing over \$6,000,000 a year appointed to enforce a specific law; and yet when these men start out they are practically told "we will give you for your services as agent and inspector \$1,728 a year; but we will place you at some little town where you will not live, and where you will never go; but by placing you there you can draw from \$4 to \$5 a day additional compensation." Right at the inception of the employment they tell a man who is paid to enforce the law that he must violate the law in order to get additional funds out of the Treasury of the United States. Now, the gentleman says that these are the exceptions; and it may be so, but would it not seem strange that the only exceptions in the United States should be found in the one district in the United States where a little investigation was made?

We looked into these matters as much as we could in the hearings. At the time we did it we knew our course would be criticized. We knew it would draw fire from the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] and others who get their directions not from constituents, but from dictators here in Washington, who propose to tell Congress just how much shall be appropriated for a given purpose. I do not know what others think about it, but I do not believe that this Congress or any Congress can afford to take the dictation of any man or any set of men with regard to appropriations out of the Treasury of the United States. [Applause.] I think we ought to go into this question of the enforcement of the prohibition act just as we go into every question, and if there is waste and inefficient methods employed in the enforcement of prohibition, we ought to criticize it just as freely as we criticize other expenditures. Personally I think we have given them all that is necessary this year for the enforcement of prohibition, so far as that enforcement can reasonably be carried on for the first year by the National Government. To properly enforce that law everyone knows that there must be the closest cooperation of State and local authorities. I personally know that by building up so large an organization in so short a time a great many men are connected with it who ought not to be connected with it. A great many men, some of whom are in the bureaus here in Washington, do not believe in the enforcement of the law; some are in the field who are not only winking at its violation but actively aiding in the violation of the law. I do think by cutting down this appropriation we will serve notice not only on Mr. Kramer but the 11 district supervisors and the 44 State supervisors, some of whom are not qualified to administer the law, that their failure to enforce the law is under investigation. Weed out the undesirables in this service and the department will have more money than it can properly expend in the enforcement of this law.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.



Mr. JUUL. You carry \$6,000,000 for the enforcement of prohibition?

Mr. GOOD. The amount carried in this bill brings the total for enforcement of prohibition up to \$6,500,000, and in addition there will be paid in bonuses about \$490,000.

Mr. JUUL. Is there any special item carried in the bill for the suppression of highway robbery? [Laughter.]

Mr. GOOD. No; not in this bill.

Now, take the Military Establishment; we carried \$48,000,000, all told. That is made up of several items, and the appropriation is made necessary largely because of the increase in the number of enlisted men. The Secretary of War requested \$40,000,000 for the pay of the Army. That estimate was made on the theory that there would be in the service for the year an average of 227,650 men. On the 31st of January last the Army had an enlisted strength of 237,149 men. The War Department was then enlisting at a rate of 1,000 per day, and the separations from the service amounted to about 7,000 a month, leaving a net increase in the service of about 23,000 men per month. It is now estimated that there are approximately 240,000 men in the military service of the United States. It was stated before the committee that if the resolution, which has since been adopted, should become a law by the 1st of February, that the War Department would be able to reduce the size of the Army so that we would have during the year an average of 208,797 enlisted men. It is thus seen that the passage of the resolution reducing the size of the Army to 175,000 enlisted men will have the effect of reducing the average size of the Army for the year about 20,000 enlisted men.

It was the opinion of the committee that we could therefore reduce the estimate of the Secretary of War from \$40,000,000 to \$24,000,000 for the pay of the Army. It necessarily follows that by reducing the number of the enlisted men by 20,000 that there could be a corresponding reduction in the request for an appropriation for subsistence and supplies. The estimate for this was \$32,273,987, while the bill carries \$22,000,000 for that purpose. A part of this reduction was also due to recent reductions made in the rations from 54 cents to 42 cents per ration.

The largest reduction in the estimates was made in the Navy Department. This reduction was made possible through the discovery that in the general account of advances for the Navy Department for the fiscal years 1917, 1918, 1919, and 1920, for which requests were made for deficiency appropriations, there were corresponding balances, and if the Navy Department was authorized to use balances remaining for certain objects, to extinguish deficiencies or deficits in appropriations for other objects, they would not need any money at all. It was purely a bookkeeping matter. Everything for which the deficiency estimate was made had been purchased and paid for, but the payment had been made out of the general account of advances, and they were able to make it because there were surpluses in certain appropriations. You must understand that under the law the Navy Department, and recently the War Department, handle their appropriations in a different manner from all other appropriations. Ordinarily when an appropriation is made for a given service that service is given a credit of the amount of the appropriation on the books of the Treasury Department.

Not so with the Navy Department. When the appropriation bill becomes a law, the total amount of the bill is credited to the department in one item and is called general account of advances. When checks are drawn on this appropriation, whether it be for contingent expenses or for transportation and recruiting or for the Bureau of Yards and Docks or Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, for training stations, or for any service, that check is paid out of the general account of advances, and the Treasury Department never knows whether any given appropriation is overdrawn or not. It continues to pay the checks so long as anything remains in the appropriation and credited to the general account of advances. The Committee on Naval Affairs has reported out a bill which, if enacted into law, will permit the Secretary of the Navy to balance his books. Certainly this is a businesslike way to adjust the matter, and the committee therefore was able to reduce the estimates by \$114,339,131 for the Naval Establishment because of the proposed legislation authorizing such transfers.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That bill is not likely to pass at this session of Congress.

Mr. GOOD. No.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is it necessary to have the legislation in order to relieve these officers who have made the payments contrary to law, so that in the end a deficit is shown?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; either that or to make appropriations to cover those deficits. We did not feel warranted in doing that. It will be necessary some time. I do not think there is any hurry about it. The accounts are there. The services were secured. Everybody got his money, and the only difficulty is that they have gotten into a little trouble as to the accounts. They had money enough, but they have not expended it along the lines directed by Congress.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. When this bill passes the House and goes to the Senate, I suppose that if the Senate should add an amendment, according to the provisions of the bill reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, it might possibly be agreed to by the House.

Mr. GOOD. I imagine that is so. Now, there is a large item in the bill for a deficiency in the Postal Department. The total estimates for the Postal Service were \$57,500,000. The principal item that goes to make up this total was \$35,650,000 for inland transportation by railroads, and the deficiency is due to the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission of December 23, 1919, increasing the compensation of railroads for carrying mails. The bill also carries \$7,000,000 for temporary and auxiliary clerk hire. That is made necessary because of the inability of the Postal Service to obtain regular employees to do the work and used temporary employees. The deficiencies in the Post Office Department can in no wise be attributed to any cut by Congress in the requests for appropriations by the department for this year. The total appropriations carried for the fiscal year 1921 to the Post Office appropriation act for similar purposes to those for which deficiencies are provided for in this bill aggregate \$92,687,320, while the estimates submitted by the Post Office Department last year for said appropriations aggregated but \$88,423,500. In other words, in the appropriation act Congress made no reduction in the estimates for the services in the Post Office Department for which deficiencies are now asked, but, on the other hand, Congress appropriated more money than the Postmaster General asked for those services.

The surplus in the Postal Service about which so much has been said and written is rapidly disappearing, and when all of the expenditures are in that surplus will be turned into a deficit. In determining whether or not there is a deficit in the postal operations, we should not consider as a part of the postal receipts the war revenue derived from the Postal Service. That revenue was not intended for the Postal Service, but was expressly provided to pay a part of the expense to carry on the war. Looking, therefore, at the finances of the Postal Service for the fiscal years 1918, 1919, and 1920, the situation is as follows:

Audited surplus, 1918	\$64,126,774.08
Less war revenue	44,500,000.00
Net audited surplus for 1918	19,626,774.08
Audited surplus, 1919	73,734,851.96
Less war revenue	71,302,000.00
Net audited surplus for 1919	2,342,851.96
Audited deficit, 1920	17,270,482.72
1920 items in this bill	2,555,454.31
Total deficit, 1920	19,825,937.03
Audited surplus, 1918	19,626,774.08
Audited surplus, 1919	2,342,851.96
Surplus, 1918 and 1919	21,969,626.04
Less 1920 deficit	19,825,937.03
Net surplus, 1918, 1919, and 1920	2,143,689.01
Estimates submitted in Senate Document No. 373 to pay Railroad Administration for carrying mails during period of Federal control, being from Jan. 1, 1918, to Feb. 29, 1920, covering part of the fiscal year 1918, all of the fiscal year 1919, and part of the fiscal year 1920	65,575,832.03
Deduct net surplus for 1918, 1919, 1920	2,143,689.01
Deficit for the three fiscal years	63,432,143.02
Post Office Department, fiscal year 1917	
Audited surplus, fiscal year 1917	\$9,836,211.90
Audited claims in this bill on account of railroad transportation for 1917	9,377,321.93
Reduces surplus, 1917, to	458,889.97
This sum will be wiped out by additional claims for 1917 which will be certified to Congress later, and a deficit of more than a million dollars for 1917 will result.	
Fiscal year 1921.	
Appropriations for fiscal year 1921 for Postal Service, including estimated amount of \$41,855,510 to be paid from indefinite appropriation to carry out provisions of reclassification act	\$504,434,700.00
Deficiency appropriations for 1921 in this bill	55,003,700.00
Total for 1921	559,438,400.00

The revenues for the service for the fiscal year 1920 amounted to \$487,350,212.33. The rate of increase in receipts for the first six months of fiscal year 1921 averaged 19.81 per cent. If this ratio continues during the remainder of the year the receipts for 1921 will aggregate

	\$523,649,657.39
Total appropriations for 1921 already made or pending	559,438,400.00
Estimated revenues	523,649,657.39

Estimated deficit 35,788,742.61

This deficit will likely be nearer \$50,000,000.

Therefore, the approximate known deficits from the foregoing are as follows:

1917	\$1,000,000.00
1918, 1919, 1920	63,432,143.02
1921	35,788,742.61
Total	100,220,885.63

I desire briefly to call attention to one of the big estimates for which no provision is made.

Mr. FESS. Would the gentleman yield before entering upon that?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. There is a general impression that these deficits or deficiencies are created without sanction of law, at least some of them.

Mr. GOOD. The amounts carried in the bill as deficiencies for the Navy Department, the Post Office Department, and many other services are legal deficiencies. Some of them were caused by the enactment of laws after the appropriation bills were enacted, requiring additional expenditures. Many of them, however, are created in violation of law.

Mr. FESS. Well, is not there some way by which we can avoid that?

Mr. GOOD. Some of the deficiencies of the War Department were authorized by law. The War Department is authorized, as is the Navy Department, to create deficiencies for certain purposes, such as clothing, subsistence, forage, fuel, quarters, or transportation. But, generally speaking, all appropriations made for contingent expenses or other general purposes, except appropriations made in fulfillment of contract obligations, expressly authorized by law, are required to be allotted at the beginning of each fiscal year by monthly or other allotment, so as to prevent expenditures in one portion of the year which may necessitate deficiencies during the latter part of the year. In many of the departments that law is being observed, but in some cases it is not observed. The matter, however, is purely administrative, as the gentleman knows. It is not in the province of Congress to administer the law. When we find that an official has taken the law in his own hands and spends more money than Congress appropriated, we must then decide whether we will grant enough money to continue needed activities for the remainder of the year, or refuse to grant the money and stop the activity. Where the service is a necessary one the committee have reported an appropriation, although they have felt that the law ought to be strictly enforced. It ought to be brought home to every disbursing officer and every officer of the Government who has anything to do with administering appropriations that the antideficiency law should be strictly observed.

Mr. FESS. That is the source of my question. I thought we had some regulation, and whether it is being observed or not, is it our fault; and if it is our fault, how are we going to correct it?

Mr. GOOD. Failure to enforce the law by an administrative official is not the fault of Congress. It makes it very embarrassing for Congress when we must determine whether the Government shall suffer through the failure of some official to strictly enforce the law. To refuse to give the money for a service when the person who had administration of the fund appropriated spent it all during the first nine months might mean that a very needful service would be discontinued.

In this connection, permit me to say that it might be contended that because we cut estimates for this year by \$1,812,000,000 there would naturally be a great deficit. Outside of the War Department, where the estimates were for an Army of 576,000 men, and Congress only appropriated for something less than 175,000 men, and outside of the Navy Department, where Congress increased the pay of officers in the Navy and Marine Corps, which required about \$30,000,000 to pay the increase provided for after the estimate was made—outside of these two departments the total amount carried in the bill to supply deficiencies is only \$2,800,000. In other words, the deficiencies did not occur in those items where Congress cut the estimates, but they were incurred in other services. In those items where we cut the estimates, the deficiencies carried in this bill are but \$2,800,000.

Mr. FESS. So it is not true that these are a mere matter of bookkeeping?

Mr. GOOD. Not at all. Take the Navy Department. The gentleman will recall that we appropriated \$10,000,000 for fuel and that is just what the Secretary of the Navy asked for. In the first six months the department spent \$18,267,412, or more than \$8,000,000 in excess of the amount estimated for the whole year. And we are carrying in the bill to make good that deficit \$8,267,000 for the first six months, and for coal for the Navy for the second six months \$20,000,000, which will give the Navy Department for fuel for the year \$30,000,000 instead of \$10,000,000, as originally estimated by the department.

The bill also carries for the Military Establishment over \$48,000,000, practically all of which was made necessary because the Secretary of War increased the enlisted strength of the Army over 175,000 men.

Mr. FESS. If the gentleman will permit, under the item he has just given, where an appropriation of \$10,000,000 was made and they spent \$18,000,000, is not that irregular and unlawful?

Mr. GOOD. That is one of the items where the law provides that the Navy Department may make purchases in excess of the appropriations and is a legal deficiency.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. The fact, as I understand from what the gentleman says, is that as to the essential services that we appropriated for there is only about \$2,800,000 of deficit?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; assuming also that Congress had refused to pass the increased pay bill, which took about \$65,000,000 or \$70,000,000.

Mr. MONDELL. I refer to matters within the estimates. That is a matter entirely outside of the estimates. When the estimates were made that increase of pay was not contemplated, and was not contained in their estimates.

Mr. GOOD. That is true.

Mr. MONDELL. So as to the matters contained within the estimates relating to the essential services of the Government, the deficiency is \$2,800,000?

Mr. GOOD. Except the War Department.

Mr. MONDELL. Except where the War Department went defiantly beyond the will of Congress in recruiting?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; but the War Department, the gentleman will recall, did make large estimates for this year. The estimate of that department was for an Army of 576,000 men, and Congress did cut that estimate. And if we eliminate the War Department, we can truthfully say that while the amount carried in this bill is large the deficiencies are not, because Congress reduced the estimates. The bill carries over \$203,000,000, of which \$48,092,960 is for the Military Establishment, leaving more than \$155,000,000 for other services, and of that only \$2,800,000 is to supply deficiencies in items where Congress reduced the estimates of the executive departments.

Mr. McKINLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. McKINLEY. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement that the country will read, and I want to ask this: Now, as I understand, the post-office appropriations and the post-office receipts will about balance?

Mr. GOOD. No; the post-office receipts for this year, for the first six months, increased about 19 per cent over last year. But the indications are that this rate of increase will not be kept up. If they fall off, as now seems probable, there will be a deficit in the Postal Service, not of \$35,000,000 but probably of \$80,000,000.

Mr. McKINLEY. Calling it \$60,000,000, as I understand, the appropriations, including the \$60,000,000, are \$1,900,000,000, and to that is to be added about \$1,200,000,000 interest and sinking fund, making a little over \$3,000,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. For next year; yes. I have tried to show that for next year the total appropriations ought not to exceed \$3,500,000,000.

Mr. McKINLEY. And that includes the Post Office Department?

Mr. GOOD. That includes the Post Office Department.

Mr. McKINLEY. Leaving that out, it is about \$3,000,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. About \$3,000,000,000.

Mr. McKINLEY. The gentleman has stated that the estimates are about \$4,000,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. The estimates are \$4,701,000,000, including the Postal Service. It is pretty hard to say what the expenditures are going to be for this year; they will be much larger than they will be for next year. We are not yet through with paying war obligations. Since we reported this bill estimates for still more deficiencies have come in. I can not say at this time



what the expenditures will be for this year. The figures I have used have to do with the appropriations for the next fiscal year.

Mr. McKINLEY. For the succeeding year of 1922, for which you are making these appropriations—

Mr. GOOD. Yes. The total amount carried in all of the House bills, including the Postal Service, and estimating the fortifications bill at \$14,000,000, is \$3,498,000,000.

Mr. McKINLEY. And that includes interest and sinking fund?

Mr. GOOD. It includes everything of that kind.

Mr. McKINLEY. And it brings it up to about \$3,000,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. It brings it up to \$3,000,000,000, leaving out the Postal Service.

Mr. McKINLEY. But you have stated it will be about \$4,000,000,000, as I understood?

Mr. GOOD. I have said the estimates were about \$4,701,000,000, and I have said the total amount carried in the House bills aggregates \$2,162,000,000, and the permanent and indefinite appropriations, including \$35,000,000 for bonus, will bring the total amount carried in the House bills up to \$3,498,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. There are \$800,000 reported in this bill as deficiency for the air mail service in the Post Office Department?

Mr. GOOD. About that amount was included in the estimates for inland transportation.

Mr. MADDEN. Did the gentleman go into the question of whether there was any authority existing in the Postmaster General to create that deficiency?

Mr. GOOD. We did not. We took the gentleman's bill this year, in which there was reported an item of \$1,200,000, which went out on a point of order, and assumed that it was necessary, and, therefore, carried the item in the transportation of mails, just as it was carried last year.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to say that while there was \$1,200,000 carried in the bill for the authorized mail routes, \$800,000 of a deficiency requested by the department was for an unauthorized route.

Mr. GOOD. That, as I understand, is a question of administration. If they could use the air service as cheaply as transportation by rail, then they were authorized to spend the money in that way.

Mr. MADDEN. The routes that were created, on which this deficiency was based, were never authorized either by appropriation or by law.

Mr. STEENERSON. I want the gentleman to finish. What was the estimate?

Mr. GOOD. I do not have the exact amount before me. My recollection is that we gave exactly what was estimated for. The gentleman can get the exact figures in the report.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman was going to state that a moment ago.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, there is one item in the bill that I wish to discuss briefly, and that is the estimate of \$95,000,000 for the emergency shipping fund. We have not carried anything in the bill, and we have refused to carry an appropriation for obvious reasons. In the first place, the War Department, it is claimed by the Shipping Board, owes it \$208,000,000 on which there have been advances aggregating \$53,000,000, leaving it with an account payable against the War Department of \$153,000,000.

The War Department has the appropriation and is willing to pay any amount which they are legally required to pay, but the Shipping Board has been unable to furnish the vouchers and to make the showing so that the War Department can make payment on many of their claims. The Shipping Board estimated that it would require \$95,000,000 to carry on its operations to the end of the year. Since these estimates were made it has received from the War Department \$13,000,000. It has some other credits that it will unquestionably collect before the end of the year, so that if it shall be able to obtain as much as \$40,000,000 additional from the War Department, it is the opinion of the committee that it will be unnecessary to make further appropriations for this fiscal year.

I can well understand the embarrassment of the Shipping Board. The members of the board have not been confirmed, and they naturally hesitate to formulate broad policies which must be adopted if we are to have a real merchant marine. They are, therefore, simply marking time, and this is necessarily so. I hesitate to criticize the Shipping Board, because I realize that when criticism is made of a body that it reflects upon the members of the board personally. I have felt that the affairs of the Shipping Board are in a very bad way and that the Emergency Fleet Corporation, which I suppose is the biggest corporation in

the world, has in the main been very poorly managed. But in saying this I do not mean to reflect upon the ability of the men who from time to time have been associated in this great undertaking. At times some of the most eminent business and professional men of the country have been connected with this organization.

The difficulty is there have been too many changes in the organization. No one has been allowed to stay in the organization long enough to master it; no sooner would a person show a high degree of efficiency than he was either removed or permitted to resign, and with every change in the personnel there has been a change in policy. All of this is greatly to be regretted, for it has led to confusion and inefficiency all along the line. My own opinion is that we will in the future experience difficulty in securing the right kind of men to manage this huge corporation, with the small salaries which Congress has provided, and it may be necessary to change the law in this respect. For if this service is to succeed we must be able to retain the men after they have become familiar with their duties.

Because of these changes, and because of the magnitude of the transactions, and not because of lack of ability or of hard work, the Shipping Board has not been able to function in a healthy and efficient way. For example, it is unable to present to the War Department the evidence of the War Department's indebtedness to the Shipping Board so that the claims can be paid. The chartering of its boats is on a principle calculated to entail great loss by the Government because of operations. For example, here is a shipping concern with, say, 10 vessels of its own, and it has been able to charter 5 boats from the Shipping Board.

To-day practically all vessels are running at a loss. So the concern owning 10 vessels of its own ties up its own vessels and discharges most of its men and cuts down its loss to the minimum; but the 5 vessels that are chartered from the Shipping Board are found in operation, and the Government pays the loss. This may be an extreme case, but it illustrates a principle that is wrong and the need for more businesslike administration of this great enterprise.

There are, as I recall, 73 boats being constructed for the Emergency Fleet Corporation. They are in various stages of completion, all the way from 15 to 98 per cent completed. To stop work upon them might make the Government answerable in damages, which would greatly increase the cost. It might entail great financial losses upon contractors. It was the opinion of the committee that these boats should be completed, and that in some way the money should be made available to complete the program. It was also the opinion of the committee that the Shipping Board should immediately take prompt action to cut off the loss in the Division of Operations, and in granting new charters the contracts should be so safeguarded that the loss to the Government will in any emergency be reduced to the minimum.

So far as securing funds the committee felt that there is but one thing for the Shipping Board to do, and that is for it to present its vouchers to the War Department and others that are owing the Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation and make its collections, and when it has done this it could then come to Congress, if necessary, for additional new money.

But it is unthinkable for this organization, with these large credits outstanding, to continue its operations on the theory that no matter how inefficiently it may function that Congress will supply the money. The first step for the Shipping Board to take is to settle with the other departments of the Government that are owing it money, and when this settlement has been made there will be ample time for Congress to supply any deficiency in the appropriations.

It has been suggested that the Shipping Board spend several millions of dollars, and the War Department spend several millions more, in auditing the claims of the Shipping Board against the War Department. Obviously this ought not to take place. It seems to me that the War Department should settle with the Shipping Board just as it settled with the Railroad Administration without an expensive audit. It is all Government money. Here are two branches of the Government—the Shipping Board and the War Department. One owes the other some money. The War Department, in this instance, has an appropriation available for this purpose of more than \$60,000,000, and these two departments of the Government should get together and agree upon a settlement and adjust their claims, and then Congress can in the future make appropriations with a full knowledge of the outstanding credits of the Shipping Board. Until that settlement is made Congress, it seems to me, will be rather loathe to make deficiency appropriations for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, there is another reason why the committee refused to make further appropriations at this time for the Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation. It was discovered that some time ago the Shipping Board passed a resolution preventing shipbuilders who had contracts for building ships for the Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation from decreasing wages to any of the employees in the yards. It will be recalled that after we started the program of building these ships, because of the increased cost of living and the increase in wages everywhere, it was necessary to increase the pay of the employees, and their wages were very rapidly as well as generously increased. In many cases they were doubled. These increases were based upon the high cost of living. It seemed strange, indeed, to the committee that those who had contracts for building ships on a cost plus a fee basis should be told by the Shipping Board that the contractor could not reduce his wages at all. I understand that this resolution of the Shipping Board remained effective until a few weeks ago, when the board passed a resolution rescinding the former order. It seems to me it ought to have gone further and required the shipbuilders to decrease wages in view of the fact that the cost of living has been very much decreased in the last few months. But nowhere has the board taken an affirmative position that would bring about some reduction in the cost of these vessels to the Government. The cost of living has been going down and down, and yet these men who are employed by the various contractors building these 73 ships are paid the same wages that they were paid when the cost of living was at the peak.

The committee was gratified over the broad, patriotic view taken by the men who are engaged in building these ships in one of the yards. I hold in my hand a petition signed by more than 10,000 laborers employed in the yards of the New York Shipbuilding Corporation at Camden, N. J., where we have been building 16 of the large passenger-cargo ships. Four or five of these ships have already been completed and the others are nearing completion. These laborers realized that their employers could not get new contracts on the present wage schedule. These laborers also realized that the work on the 11 or 12 Government ships still in the yards would all be completed within three or four months, and when completed, if the corporation did not get new contracts, they would be out of work. They looked at the matter in a practical way, and reasoned that they would rather take a decreased wage now, and thereby enable their employers to secure new contracts for new work, and thus enable them to have continued employment, than to be thrown out of work entirely. And so they came to Congress with this petition, as I feel they had a right to do, asking that the money be made available to complete these ships, and they state in their petition that they are perfectly willing to take a reduction in wages. When the representatives of these men came before the committee they were asked how much of a reduction the laborers in these yards were willing to take, and they stated that they were talking of a 20 per cent reduction. It is almost unthinkable that the men employed in building these ships have sensed the business and industrial outlook before the Shipping Board sensed it, or, at least, before they took action looking toward a resumption of normal activities.

And this is what is necessary all over the country. In every industry and calling wages were increased because of war and war conditions, to meet the increased cost of food and of clothing. Now that the prices of these commodities have gone down, the price of labor must follow. I have here a report just issued from the United States Employment Service of the Department of Labor, dated January 21, 1921. That report shows the percentage of people employed in the different lines of production, as compared with January 1, 1920. It shows that the percentage employed in metal production is 69 per cent, in building trades 47.6 per cent, in textile products and clothing 64 per cent, in the leather group 65 per cent, in the automobile group 30 per cent, in lumber and housing group 67 per cent, and in the clay, glass, and cement group 80 per cent, as compared with January 1, 1920. This report would indicate that more than 25 per cent of the people employed in these industries on January 1, 1920, are out of employment to-day. The percentage of unemployed will increase until we strike something like a reasonable basis.

Here are some advertisements sent out by the Northern Pine Lumber Manufacturers' Association. These advertisements are of the size of an ordinary newspaper, and they are requesting builders in the United States not to buy lumber or to engage in building enterprises until the costs are more reasonable. At first blush it is strange, indeed, that lumber manufacturers whose business depends upon sales take the initiative and advertise

all over the United States for people not to buy their products until prices of their products come down. But they are actuated by the same motives that the laborers in the New York Shipbuilding Corporation are actuated by when they say to Congress that they are perfectly willing to take a reduction in their wages in order that they may have continued employment.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. HASTINGS. What reason do the lumbermen give for sending out that kind of an advertisement?

Mr. GOOD. Obviously they are looking at the question just as the laborers in the New York Shipbuilding Corporation yards looked at it. They realize that a substantial going business can not be built upon present abnormal prices and that the cost of production must be decreased before business can start in a healthy way. Production costs are too high all along the line. They are coming down, and just in the proportion that they are reduced will the cost of living to the American people be reduced. I suppose lumber manufacturers realize, as they must realize, that building operations will not start in a big way until they can be carried forward on a basis that is reasonable, so far as costs are concerned. And hence they are willing to hasten the day when they can start their business on a sound basis. To start it on a false basis will mean loss and finally disaster. Why is it that there is a lack of employment in America to-day, as shown by the United States Employment Service, of more than 25 per cent as compared with January, 1920? It is because people will not buy at these abnormally high prices. Prices are high because the cost of production is high, and the cost of production is high because labor, which is the principal item in production, is excessively high.

The Committee on Appropriations realized this situation two years ago, and we formulated a policy then that the Government of the United States should not engage in a building program at that time and that our appropriations, so far as public works were concerned, with very few exceptions, should be limited to maintenance items. That was not true with regard to the shipbuilding program, because the contracts had already been let for the ships, while we were at war. What Congress should do first of all, what the administration should have done and should yet do, is to encourage men in a patriotic way to see that it is to their advantage to accept lower wages, because in the end it will mean continuous employment and will mean that the cost of the things they will be compelled to buy out of their wages will be correspondingly reduced.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The gentleman speaks of the advertisement of the lumber manufacturers advising the purchasers not to buy lumber until the price was reduced. I would like to inquire whether they have reduced the price of lumber themselves, whether they have not that matter in their own hands?

Mr. GOOD. I have not looked into that question, but I understand that the price of lumber, on the whole, has been reduced by more than 25 per cent. But the price is still prohibitive. The gentleman must know that a tree in the forest is of no great value. It is not until it has been laid low, hauled to the mill, sawed into lumber, placed on the cars and sent to the lumberyards that it becomes of much value. Every one of these operations requires labor, and I suppose that a large part of the price we are compelled to pay for lumber is to reimburse the manufacturer for what he has been compelled to pay in wages in order to produce the lumber. Possibly his profits are too high. If so, in the same spirit the laborer is asked to reduce his wage should we ask the manufacturer and the dealer to reduce his profits. This is absolutely necessary.

I have already consumed more time than I had intended and the discussion has taken a much larger range than I anticipated. When the bill is read under the five-minute rule I shall be very glad to explain any of the items contained in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the committee do now rise. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.



## RECESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 1 o'clock p. m.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 1 o'clock p. m. Before acting upon that request the Chair would suggest to gentlemen that on the counting of the electoral vote the law provides that the seats on the right of the Chair shall be left vacant for the Senate. The Chair is informed by the Doorkeeper that it will require four rows, so that gentlemen will please occupy other seats and leave the first four rows for the use of the Senate. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 1 o'clock.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Would you take four rows over here instead of taking three rows clear across?

The SPEAKER. By the law providing for the counting of the electoral vote it has been enacted that the seats on the right of the Chair shall be occupied by the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that, Mr. Speaker, on account of the fact that this side of the aisle is preferable to the Senate? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know why it was done. Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 1 o'clock p. m.

The recess having expired, the House resumed its session.

## COUNTING THE ELECTORAL VOTE.

At 1 o'clock p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and the Senate of the United States.

The Senate entered the Hall, preceded by their Sergeant at Arms, and headed by the Vice President and the Secretary of the Senate, the Members and officers of the House rising to receive them.

The VICE PRESIDENT took his seat as the presiding officer of the joint convention of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House occupying the chair on his left.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen of the convention, the two Houses of Congress, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and the laws of the United States, are now in joint convention for the purpose of opening the certificates and ascertaining and counting the votes of the several States for President and Vice President. Under well-established precedents, unless demand shall be made in any case, the reading of the formal portions of the certificates will be dispensed with. After ascertainment has been had that the certificates are authentic and correct in form, the tellers will count and make a list of the votes of the States.

Twelve years ago, upon an occasion similar to this, the then Vice President of the United States, my warm personal friend, Charles Warren Fairbanks, of Indiana, suppressed any manifestation of approval or disapproval upon the part of the galleries or the members of the joint convention, announcing at that time what seemed to me to be a proper statement, that this is a solemn and important occasion in the affairs of the people of America, and it should be discharged with dignity and in silence.

The tellers will please take their places at the desk. The tellers will count and make a list of the votes of the State of Alabama.

Mr. LODGE (one of the tellers). Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Alabama seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that James M. Cox, of Ohio, received 12 votes for President and Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York, 12 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the reading of the formal portions of the certificates will be dispensed with, and the Chair will open in alphabetical order the certificates showing the electoral votes of each State, and the tellers will count and make announcement of the results in the several States.

There was no objection.

The tellers then proceeded to read, count, and announce, as was done in the case of Alabama, the electoral votes of the several States in their alphabetical order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen of the convention, the certificates of all of the States have now been opened and read, and the tellers will make final ascertainment of the result and deliver the same to the President of the Senate.

The tellers delivered to the Vice President the following statement of the result:

The undersigned, HENRY CABOT LODGE and OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, tellers on the part of the Senate, and FLORIAN LAMPERT and WILLIAM W. RUCKER, tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States for the term beginning on the 4th day of March, 1921:

Electoral votes of each State.	States.	For President.		For Vice President.	
		Warren G. Harding, of Ohio.	James M. Cox, of Ohio.	Calvin Coolidge, of Massachusetts.	Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York.
12	Alabama.....	.....	12	.....	12
3	Arizona.....	3	.....	3	.....
9	Arkansas.....	.....	9	.....	9
13	California.....	.....	.....	13	.....
6	Colorado.....	6	.....	6	.....
7	Connecticut.....	7	.....	7	.....
3	Delaware.....	3	.....	3	.....
6	Florida.....	.....	6	.....	6
14	Georgia.....	.....	14	.....	14
4	Idaho.....	4	.....	.....	.....
29	Illinois.....	29	.....	29	.....
15	Indiana.....	15	.....	15	.....
13	Iowa.....	13	.....	13	.....
10	Kansas.....	10	.....	10	.....
13	Kentucky.....	.....	13	.....	13
10	Louisiana.....	.....	10	.....	10
6	Maine.....	6	.....	6	.....
8	Maryland.....	8	.....	8	.....
18	Massachusetts.....	18	.....	18	.....
15	Michigan.....	15	.....	15	.....
12	Minnesota.....	12	.....	12	.....
10	Mississippi.....	.....	10	.....	10
18	Missouri.....	18	.....	18	.....
4	Montana.....	4	.....	4	.....
8	Nebraska.....	8	.....	8	.....
3	Nevada.....	3	.....	3	.....
4	New Hampshire.....	4	.....	4	.....
14	New Jersey.....	14	.....	14	.....
3	New Mexico.....	3	.....	3	.....
45	New York.....	45	.....	45	.....
12	North Carolina.....	.....	12	.....	12
5	North Dakota.....	5	.....	5	.....
24	Ohio.....	24	.....	24	.....
10	Oklahoma.....	10	.....	10	.....
5	Oregon.....	5	.....	5	.....
38	Pennsylvania.....	38	.....	38	.....
5	Rhode Island.....	5	.....	5	.....
9	South Carolina.....	.....	9	.....	9
5	South Dakota.....	5	.....	5	.....
12	Tennessee.....	12	.....	12	.....
20	Texas.....	.....	20	.....	20
4	Utah.....	4	.....	4	.....
4	Vermont.....	4	.....	4	.....
12	Virginia.....	.....	12	.....	12
7	Washington.....	7	.....	7	.....
8	West Virginia.....	8	.....	8	.....
13	Wisconsin.....	13	.....	13	.....
3	Wyoming.....	3	.....	3	.....
531		404	127	404	127

HENRY CABOT LODGE,  
OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,  
Tellers on the part of the Senate.

FLORIAN LAMPERT,  
WILLIAM W. RUCKER,  
Tellers on the part of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen of the convention, the report of the state of the vote as delivered to the President of the Senate is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Warren G. Harding, of the State of Ohio, has received for President of the United States 404 votes;

James M. Cox, of the State of Ohio, has received 127 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Calvin Coolidge, of the State of Massachusetts, has received for Vice President of the United States 404 votes;

Franklin D. Roosevelt, of the State of New York, has received 127 votes.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the 4th day of March,

1921, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Gentlemen of the convention, the purposes for which this joint convention was called having been accomplished, as presiding officer I dissolve this joint convention, and the Senate will return to its Chamber.

The Senate (at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) retired from the Hall, and (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Speaker resumed the chair and called the House to order.

#### DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

On motion of Mr. Good, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the first deficiency bill, H. R. 15962, with Mr. LONGWORTH in the chair.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I expect to occupy only a very limited time in the discussion of this bill. I think the Appropriations Committee and the subcommittee that had under consideration this bill have made a genuine, patriotic effort to cut down the expenses of the Government. I believe that is so regardless of politics of the whole House, as well as of the Appropriations Committee, but I notice from time to time an effort is made to take rather too much credit by one of the political parties for the cut that is made in these bills. A criticism is indulged in at times because it was necessary to appropriate a large amount of money for the Army in this deficiency appropriation bill. A criticism is made of the Secretary of War because he enlisted the force of the Army above 175,000 men. If criticism is just anywhere, it should fall upon the shoulders of the Congress of the United States and not on the Secretary of War. Last year we enacted an Army reorganization law which provided for an Army of 280,000 men. At the time the bill was under consideration an effort was made to limit the Army to 185,000 men. That was voted down by this House. It was, therefore, not illogical for the Secretary of War to assume that if the Congress did not want to limit the Army to 185,000 men, it wanted him to enlist the number placed in the bill, namely, 280,000 men.

I have observed at other times, not so much in the discussion of this bill as in other bills, a keen, incisive criticism because it became necessary to appropriate money for the pay of the Army in a deficiency bill. If you will go back and look at the record, you will find that practically every year for the last 20 years it has been necessary to bring in a deficiency appropriation for the pay of the Army. In the year 1900—20 years ago—when the Government was in the control of a Republican Congress and a Republican President, it was necessary to appropriate in the deficiency bill \$4,000,000 for the pay of the Army. In 1901 \$3,000,000 were appropriated in a deficiency bill for the pay of the Army. In 1902 it was \$1,500,000, in 1904, \$1,500,000, and in 1905, \$1,500,000. In 1907 it was nearly two million, and so on down the line practically every year. If I have permission, I shall put the list of deficiency appropriations in the Record, made for the payment of the Army.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Statistical records of that kind are not extraneous extensions of remarks, but I am not going to object to putting such things into the Record, as I said to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Very well. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may file this brief record with my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I am not in sympathy nor in accord with the enlistment of an Army up to 280,000 men. I think 150,000 men in time of peace are sufficient, but Congress said that we should have an Army of 280,000 men, and when an effort was made to reduce that Army to 185,000 men you voted it down. Therefore, I say, the Secretary of War was justified in assuming that Congress meant what it said when it wrote 280,000 men into law and when he enlisted more than 175,000 men.

I am going to speak for a moment on one other subject which is unpopular, a subject which is an unpopular activity of the Government. I speak of the Shipping Board. I want to say in advance that I hold no brief for the Shipping Board. I hold no brief for any gentleman on the Shipping Board or anyone connected with it, but it has been made the butt of the Congress and of the people for months and months. It has been said that the Shipping Board is an extravagant concern. Perhaps it is. The Shipping Board organized under the law the greatest concern

ever organized in the same length of time. They spent \$3,000,000,000, and some of it I expect was wasted; that is, it was wasted to the extent that we got very little from it, but from the activities of the Shipping Board you have now the only asset that you have gotten from the war. You have 1,380 vessels built by the Shipping Board that will some day be valuable for carrying the trade of this country, provided the Congress and the people do not build around this country a tariff wall that will not let us have any trade. You have 1,380 vessels built by the people's money and that is some sort of an asset. You gentlemen who are always criticizing the Shipping Board should tell me what assets you have out of the money you spent for poisoned gas; tell me what assets you have out of the money that you spent for powder; tell me what assets you have out of the money that you spent for building artillery, or powder factories, or railroads and docks in France, or the billion dollars you spent for aeroplanes; tell me what assets you have out of the money used for building big military camps, or soldiers' uniforms, or railroad transportation. You have none at all, and I am not criticizing that fact; the money was spent as a military necessity. The money spent by the Shipping Board, like the money spent for the war generally, was a part of the war necessities and should be charged off as a war loss. It was nothing more or less than a war loss. We had to win the war, and we spent the money. We had to build these ships and we built a lot of ships, which we can not now use because conditions have changed. We have three or four hundred wooden ships that are practically of no value now; neither are our powder factories or our poison-gas factories. The Shipping Board is criticized because they built wooden ships. The enemy was sinking ships at the time they were building faster than we could build them, and in the judgment of the men in control it was necessary to build some sort of ships. Therefore they built wooden ships as well as steel ships, because they were building all of the steel ships they could.

I am quite in accord with what Gen. Dawes said the other day, that we would have paid horse prices for sheep to haul our artillery in France, if necessary, if the sheep could have hauled the guns to the front. So we spent money for wooden ships and now they are valueless, but if all of the steel ships had been sunk the wooden ones would have been called into commission, and they would have been of value in winning the war. We spent the money as a war necessity; let us charge it off as a war loss and turn our faces to the future.

As I stated, I hold no brief for the Shipping Board, and while I voted to bring this bill in without an appropriation for the Shipping Board, I am not willing that the people who entered into contracts with this Government to build a lot of ships shall go without their money. It was agreed in the committee that in all probability the necessary money to pay these people could be gotten from the War Department. The War Department has a lot of money appropriated by Congress. It is money that the Shipping Board claims is due it. If it is due, the Army should pay it over, and it does not make any difference whether there is an audit of the accounts or not. It is transferring the money from one Government pocket to another. The Shipping Board or some representative of the Government should have the necessary money with which to pay the men who are building these ships. The contracts for them were made in good faith with the Government. Believing that the Shipping Board or some functionary of the Government could get the money necessary to pay contractors who are building these ships from the War Department, I have for my part agreed that this bill might be brought out without an appropriation for the Shipping Board. I dare say if the Army does not provide sufficient funds with which to pay these contractors that a deficiency will be brought in and passed during this Congress to provide money to pay the contractors who are building these ships. Under these conditions I voted to bring in the bill and I support the bill. I believe the bill is as meritorious as any bill reasonably could be brought from the Committee on Appropriations, and I hope it will receive the support of gentlemen upon both sides of the aisle.

List of deficiency appropriations made for pay of the Army beginning with the fiscal year 1900.

Feb. 9, 1900, deficiency, pay of the Army	\$14,988,832.61
Mar. 3, 1901, deficiency, pay of the Army	3,000,000.00
July 1, 1902, deficiency, pay of the Army	1,500,000.00
Apr. 27, 1904, deficiency, pay of the Army	1,500,000.00
Mar. 3, 1905, deficiency, pay of the Army	1,400,000.00
Mar. 2, 1907, deficiency, pay of the Army	3,000.00
Mar. 4, 1907, deficiency, pay of the Army	574,951.14
May 30, 1908, deficiency, pay of the Army	240,000.00
May 30, 1908, deficiency, pay of the Army	500,000.00
May 30, 1908, deficiency, pay of the Army	1,250,000.00
Mar. 4, 1909, deficiency, pay of the Army	4,000,316.66
Mar. 4, 1911, deficiency, pay of the Army	453.33
Mar. 4, 1911, deficiency, pay of the Army	250,000.00



Mar. 4, 1913, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	\$7,368.00
Mar. 4, 1911, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	1,200.00
Aug. 26, 1912, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	1,800,000.00
Mar. 4, 1913, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	22,320.80
Mar. 4, 1913, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	2,897,121.20
May 25, 1914, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	1,828,663.33
Feb. 28, 1916, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	1,199,772.62
Mar. 31, 1916, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	1,577,017.42
Sept. 8, 1916, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	950,000.00
July 1, 1916, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	1,648,000.00
Apr. 17, 1917, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	647,833.33

Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD].

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to occupy any time in this debate, but some remarks were made by the chairman of the committee which I think furnish an occasion for saying something. I believe all of you who have taken any interest in the enforcement of prohibition are aware that there has been a persistent effort to misrepresent and discredit in every possible fashion the national prohibition act and the enforcement of prohibition. I had hoped that, so far as this committee was concerned and the House generally was concerned, that they would in a sympathetic fashion try to support and enforce the law, but I am sorry to say that I have some reason to suspect that at least some of the Members are not very enthusiastic. We succeeded a few days ago in getting in this House the approval of a majority, almost a majority of 2 to 1, to an increase by \$600,000 the appropriation for next year. I find on this deficiency bill a cut of \$600,000. Rather suspicious that the amount of this cut is just the same sum that we added to the next year's budget. I find the chairman now bitter against the prohibition force because of the methods he claims they are using in enforcing the law, and what is his criticism? One or two men down near his home town have been found to be located not at the place where they operate. Well, how long I do not know. Did they stay there a week or a month? He does not claim to know. There is no information on that subject. I went and got the hearings and read them over very carefully, and there is nothing in the hearings to justify the claim; nothing there to show that that is the policy. On the contrary, the commissioner in charge of this matter, when examined by the chairman, said and said emphatically that it was against the policy of the department, and that they had a system of checks to prevent that very thing. I went to Prohibition Commissioner Kramer to satisfy myself whether that sort of a policy was in force. Mr. Kramer told me it is not and that it is against the rules; that they have men whose business it is to keep check on that very thing to see it is not practiced. That apparently is the only thing that is charged against the prohibition force. Now, I do not claim that the prohibition force has been perfect. It could not be. It was built up in a hurry; it had to be; and with the small salaries that are paid it may be possible—yes, probable—that you have some people who are not strictly honest. That is true in every service. The idea of trying to break down prohibition by refusing to appropriate the necessary funds for its enforcement will not deceive anyone, and can not be justified by calling attention to an isolated violation on the part of some officer in the service. The pretense that this refusal to furnish sufficient money can be based on such an excuse is ridiculous.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I ask for two minutes more.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I have not got it.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record. It seems to me on a subject of this kind I ought to have some time to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I think the country will be greatly pleased to read the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations this forenoon to the effect that there may not be the necessity of some new form of taxation. I have been giving the question of the cost of living, and quite naturally, therefore, the cost of government, considerable study. I have been going into all the channels of information available, because it appeared to me that our biggest problem in readjustment is the tremendous cost of government that has been entailed on us by the war. I do not mention it as a subject of criticism; I mention it as the unavoidable result of war conditions. The question was, how are we going to get to a lower level of the cost of living, which, of course, is another expression for the cost of government? This much is absolutely certain: There is no hope to reduce taxes until we reduce the cost of government. That is axiomatic, and I am of the opinion that there is little

hope to reduce the cost of living until we have a basis by which we can reduce the burden of taxes. The question now is whether we can reduce the cost of government to the extent that we need not increase our taxation burden, and whether we would have the freedom to reduce our present taxation system and get away from the war system of taxation. It has been hoped by the country at large that that can be done. Our taxing system, which is justifiable in time of war, is not justifiable in time of peace.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will yield.

Mr. DUNBAR. Is it not a fact that our taxes now are only two-thirds of what they were during the time of war?

Mr. FESS. Well, taxation is the same, but the amount of taxes will be greatly reduced because of the reduction of business in the country, but the rate of taxation that was adopted in war time is still in vogue.

Mr. DUNBAR. Is not the rate of taxation less than it was during the time of war?

Mr. FESS. We have made no changes in the surtax, we have made no changes in the excess-profits tax except what was written in the law itself.

Mr. DUNBAR. Has not there been a change in the normal tax?

Mr. FESS. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. DUNBAR. Did not we have a budget that required the raising of \$6,000,000,000?

Mr. FESS. But that is a reduction of the cost of government; it is not a reduction in rate. There has been no change in taxation, and that is what I am talking about. The people would be willing to bear the burdens of war tax in time of war, but they are fretful in bearing war-time burdens in time of peace. We have the same system of taxation now in 1920 that we had in 1918 when the war was at its height.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the gentleman yield right there? I do not think he wants to be inaccurate.

Mr. FESS. No; I do not want to be.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is not the gentleman in error? Is it not a fact that in what is the revenue act of 1918, which did not become effective until 1919—we call it 1918, because it passed the House in the fall of 1918, but did not become effective until after the war—the rates of taxation were materially reduced over the previous revenue act, and that that was reflected in the payment of all our income taxes? We paid much less for that year.

Mr. FESS. Nevertheless we still have the excess-profits tax, and we still have the very high range of surtax.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the gentleman, I hope this coming Congress will materially reduce the coming taxes, but I thought he wanted to be correct in his statement that there has been no change since the war, because there has been.

Mr. FESS. I wanted to say to my friend from Indiana [Mr. DUNBAR], that the thing I am calling attention to is as to whether we can revise our present system of taxation, which I know my friend will admit is quite unscientific and ought to be revised without having to supersede it by some other form of taxation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. The suggestion made by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee was the most surprising in one way and will be the most satisfying in another of any statement that could be made by a responsible chairman of a committee, namely, that we have the trust of reducing the cost of Government to the extent that we may be able to revise our unscientific method of taxation and yet not be called upon to supersede it by some new form of taxation. If that can be done, it is the most encouraging statement that I have heard expressed from the floor of the House on taxation since the close of the war.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. McKENZIE. I fully agree with what the gentleman is saying about taxation. I want to ask him as one of our leaders in this Congress, if he does not feel that this Congress and the succeeding Congress should studiously avoid creating any new activities by legislation that would incur additional burdens to those we now have to bear?

Mr. FESS. I certainly agree with my friend from Illinois on that.

The Secretary of the Treasury rather startled the country when he first made his statement that it will take some time, indefinite yet, before we can reduce the cost of government below \$4,000,000,000. That was a statement that startled

the country, for that is four times the cost of government in 1916, and it is fully six times the cost of government in 1912. The estimates came in for \$4,700,000,000 in this Congress, and the chairman has demonstrated satisfactorily, to my mind, that we are able to cut that pretty nearly one and one-half billions and get through without in any way interfering with or injuring the necessary work of the Government. Now, if we can join our efforts and cut the cost of government all along like that, I do see the way by which we will not need to supersede our present form with any other form of taxation other than probably the revision of the tariff, which all will concede ought to increase the impost duties somewhat. But at the same time we will be able to reduce the present system to the extent that we can get rid of the present unscientific method.

I want to compliment the spirit of the committee in their effort to strike at the root of the thing. We talk about the cost of living as one objection and the high burdens of taxation as another objection.

There is positively no way that I see in which we can relieve it except in the cost of government, and that is the business of Congress now at hand.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. If we are to reduce the cost of government, should we not quit granting aid to the States to assist them in engaging in educational and benevolent work that brings duplication of bureaus here in Washington and which encourages them to look to the United States Treasury for assistance along those lines which are matters that are really State functions?

Mr. FESS. I will say to my friend that one way to reduce the cost of government is to quit making appropriations at all for anything that is new. That would be one way.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Does not the gentleman think the States ought to take care of those things that are really State functions?

Mr. FESS. Provided the function is so vast that the State can not do it and the Government must aid it, I would question the wisdom of discontinuance. I know what my friend is driving at, but he can not point to any Member of Congress that is standing with the committee more four-square to prevent introducing new things than the man he is striking at now. [Applause.]

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Thank you. I am not striking at my friend from Ohio, but I am striking against the growing habit of granting State aid on every benevolent proposition which can better be handled by the States with a great saving to the taxpayers.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks by putting in the RECORD some statements in regard to appropriations and deficiencies.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to revise his remarks by printing certain figures. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. They are tables in reference to this bill?

Mr. GOOD. They have reference to things about which I was talking—

Mr. McCLINTIC. In connection with the bill?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I have no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, during the history of this body many able men have presided over the Committee on Appropriations, and yet the service of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], the chairman of the committee during the past two years, justifies me in stating that that committee has never had a chairman who was more faithful to the public welfare and never has had one who more intelligently discharged his duties. [Applause.] And yet the Committee on Appropriations can not govern the total amount of appropriations.

The gentleman who has just preceded me, Mr. FESS, referred to the total amount of appropriations, and it caused me to think that if his committee and the other committees of this House will refrain from bringing in legislation authorizing greater expenditures on the part of the Government, we would have more hope of holding down the total appropriations to such an extent as to permit a reduction of taxes. The fact is that with this bill carrying \$203,000,000 the appropriations for the current year pass the \$5,000,000,000 mark. Direct appropriations carried in the regular supply bills amounted to \$4,859,800,327.30. This bill, recommending \$203,293,476.72, makes a total of direct appropriations of \$5,063,183,804.02.

And yet that does not tell the whole story. I have to specify and say "direct appropriations" in order to make a distinc-

tion, for during this Congress we have departed from the custom heretofore prevailing and have resorted to indirect appropriations, appropriating by authorizing the expenditure of unexpended balances, by the sale of assets, and in other methods. I have figured the amount of money that has been made available for expenditure by the departments in these indirect methods and it totals \$543,500,000 over and above the direct appropriations, so that the total amount made available to date by this Congress for governmental purposes reaches the figure of \$5,606,683,804.02, or more than five times as much as ever was appropriated by any Congress in time of peace in the history of this country.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can not just now.

These figures are so stupendous that we can not realize their true meaning. They mean, however, that to meet the expenditures authorized by this Congress for this current year we must levy an average tax of \$50 upon every man, woman, and child in America.

My good friend from Ohio [Mr. FESS] was quoted the other day as stating that this Congress would save \$1,000,000,000 by reducing estimates, and my good friend from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has frequently stated the case in that way. But reducing the estimates does not reduce the taxes. I want the Congress to stop bothering about reducing the estimates and commence to reduce appropriations and thereby reduce taxes. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], the chairman of the committee, said we have reduced the estimates here about \$270,000,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HICKS). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that in the discussion of a deficiency bill covering the expenditure of \$203,000,000 we ought to have more than 33 Congressmen on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make a point of order that there is no quorum present?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I think I will withdraw it, since I have called attention to it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee has referred to the Naval Committee reporting legislation to take care of the estimates for the Navy Department. He has induced the Naval Committee to report a bill making funds available for expenditure and thereby avoiding an appropriation. I must say that I know of no man in the House who has the shrewdness of the chairman of the committee in that regard. He has not only rendered great service to the country, but he has rendered greater service to the Republican Party than any other man that I know in this House, because he has, by resorting to this indirect method, enabled my good friend from Ohio [Mr. FESS] and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] to go before the country and boast of these reductions of estimates.

The difficulty is that it takes a long time to explain the many methods by which they have camouflaged appropriations, and that is how he is able to get away with it. When he found it was necessary to take care of the deficiencies of the Navy Department, instead of appropriating the money he simply has the Committee on Naval Affairs report out this legislation. You take those paragraphs, and you find that in the first one he says:

That the unexpended balances of annual appropriations for the fiscal years 1919 and 1920 shall be transferred, after two years from the expiration of the fiscal year for which made, to a fund to be established on the books of the Treasury Department, to which shall be charged expenditures for the fiscal year 1920 and prior years, under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted.

This simply means that out of funds which were appropriated during the war and which were unexpended and which ordinarily would go into the Treasury June 30 they will now pay this \$114,000,000 asked for by the Navy Department. The Navy Department asked for a deficiency of \$14,000,000. The gentleman from Iowa saw a way to avoid making that appropriation and yet make the money available, and therefore he had the Committee on Naval Affairs report this legislation, which takes care of \$114,000,000. The second paragraph takes care of \$300,000,000, and in the third paragraph we take care of \$40,000,000, making a total of \$454,000,000 taken care of by this legislative device. The amount will not appear in the appropriations, but the money will be made available and will be spent, and the taxpayers, who pay the bill, will never know what the Government is costing them.

The gentleman from Iowa said he was taking care of the Shipping Board. The Shipping Board wanted \$90,000,000. He says the War Department owes them \$150,000,000. He says that inasmuch as the Shipping Board really needs only \$90,000,000 to July 1 we should have appropriated the \$90,000,000 and



provided that they shall turn into the Treasury the \$150,000,000 due from the War Department. But that would make the total of appropriations larger, so the chairman of the committee simply refrains from making that appropriation, and lets them use the whole \$150,000,000, if they can get it, from the War Department. So that if they collect the \$150,000,000 they will spend it, instead of \$90,000,000, and the country will be out just \$60,000,000 on the deal. But it looks like "economy."

Now, let me call your attention to the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] as to saving a billion dollars. If you will save a billion dollars, why do you not reduce the taxes a billion dollars? If you are going to save it, why not let the people know it, by reducing the amount of money they are going to pay into the Treasury? You and I know, gentlemen, that this reduction of estimates has been going on for 20 years. There have been only two years in the last 20 years when the estimates did not exceed the appropriations. It will always be so until we shall establish an efficient budget system, because here in this Congress is the only place where an attempt is made to determine the relative importance of the demands of the different departments. We determine not only whether they are meritorious, but also whether they are urgent.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will.

Mr. FESS. What I am concerned about is this: Is there, in the judgment of the gentleman, any chance for us to reduce the cost of Government to the extent that we shall not need to proceed outside of the present system of taxation?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman can be just as certain as that he is standing there that it can not be done. You can not reduce taxes when you only reduce estimates; and my purpose in speaking here now is to call the attention of the House to the fact that it is necessary to concentrate your attention upon reducing the appropriations for the next fiscal year below those of the current year, instead of being satisfied with merely reducing estimates. [Applause.] If we do not reduce the appropriations to a most substantial extent below appropriations for the current year, when I tell you that you have made available for expenditure this year more than five and a half billion dollars, how can you reduce taxes? It can not be done.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman say that that amount will be required in another year?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It will not be required if you reduce the appropriations for the next year below those of the current year; but if you satisfy yourselves merely by reducing the sum total of the extravagant estimates, it can not be done; and unless there is some reduction hereafter, far exceeding what has been done to date, there will be no reduction of taxes. And, moreover, bills are being reported from legislative committees requiring the expenditure of large amounts. The Committee on Appropriations has no discretion in the matter. When these expenditures are authorized we will have to appropriate; and unless there is a change between this and March 4 there will be very little reduction, if any, in the total amount of money made available for expenditures during the next fiscal year.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The Ways and Means Committee in having their hearings to get the facts upon which to make a basis of taxation, so that they may revise the system, have a right, have they not, to take the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury as to the amount of money we must raise?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman from Ohio knows that any judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury must be based upon his estimate of what the Congress is going to do; and unless he has some inside information that is not available to us, he is in a hopeless fix when he tries to estimate what this Congress is going to do about appropriating money. There is no way in which he can ascertain it. If your committee reports a bill authorizing the appropriation of \$200,000,000, it will have to be met by a bill reported from the Appropriations Committee, and, manifestly, if the Secretary of the Treasury has not taken that \$200,000,000 into consideration in any estimate that he has made, he is \$200,000,000 short in his estimate, and the Ways and Means Committee will have to find the money.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This is Wednesday, and this House has already passed this week items of legislation providing for about \$450,000,000 of new appropriations that have not yet been made. Does the gentleman think that with that course followed we are likely to reduce appropriations or reduce taxes very much?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Of course, the gentleman's question answers itself, and it is as clear as anything on earth

can be that unless the brake is put on immediately the expenditures during the next fiscal year will be little, if any, below the expenditures for the current year. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS] has 21 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] has one minute remaining.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG].

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LONGWORTH). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to discuss the pending bill, but it is my purpose to call the attention of the Congress and the country to the condition of an important piece of legislation that has had the consideration of the country for many, many years. It is what is familiarly known as the packers' legislation. The packers' bill has been passed by the Senate. That bill was reported to the Committee on Agriculture of the House. That committee of the House has reported back a packers' bill, and that bill is now on the calendar for consideration. We have been debating spending the people's money, and I state that now we have an opportunity for this Congress to debate a fundamental proposition that will help the producers of this Nation, upon whom the Nation must depend for the money that we spend. Are you going to have that legislation? You can have it this week if those responsible for power here now will exercise that power. I want the country to know that that exercise of power will determine whether or not the country is to have the relief that has been demanded in the enactment of the packers' law. There are two sources of power now in this House. One is what is known as the steering committee, a concern that has no legal status. Nobody knows where it sits or what its members say. It is concealed from the public. But if reports be true, that steering committee is the supreme power in this House, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the head of that committee, who comes from the city of Chicago, the home of the packers, is exercising a dominant power on that committee, and if it is left to him the country has no hope of getting this relief.

Then the leader of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]—it is up to him to act. The country is demanding of him that he act. Committees of Congress have duly considered this bill for months and months. Reports have been made, and the bill has passed the other body. It is here on this floor. It is the duty of the leader of the responsible majority, which must act if we are to have this legislation in the interest of the producers and consumers of this Nation. It is his duty so to handle the parliamentary situation that this bill can be brought to a vote. The country is going to hold him responsible for the power that he now has. Committees of agriculturists, of stockmen, of consumers, have waited on the gentleman from Wyoming, leader of the majority, and they have written to him an open letter, which refers to a conference that representatives of organizations signing the letter had with the gentleman from Wyoming, in which he stated in substance that he is opposed to the packer control legislation, but he believes that if the Gronna bill as it passed the Senate came to a vote in the House it would be passed and go to the President, and also that as a Republican he is anxious to have a Republican President sign the packer control bill when passed by Congress. If he believes that there is a great majority in this House that is ready to pass the Gronna bill, this House is the representative body which is supposed to reflect the sentiment of the people of this Nation. If the leader of the Republican majority thinks that, then it is his duty to report this bill and have it brought up for consideration.

There is one other source of power, and that is the Committee on Rules, of which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is chairman. If he and his colleagues on that committee stand foursquare for the protection of the stockmen of this country as well as of the consumers, why not grant us a rule making this bill in order? I pledge you that if you grant that rule we will have legislation within 24 hours. How are you going to exercise that power? Answer to the country! [Applause.]

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY].

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I want to discuss for just a few minutes the same question that has been discussed by my friend from Texas [Mr. YOUNG], and that is packer legislation. I agree with the gentleman from Texas in all that he has said, but I want to approach the subject from a little different viewpoint. This is an important piece of legislation. It has been before the Congress in one form or another for a number of years. At the beginning of this session many bills were introduced both in the House and in

the Senate dealing with this subject. Extensive hearings have been held before committees of both the Senate and the House. Just a short time ago the Senate passed the Gronna bill. It came over here to the House and was referred to the Committee on Agriculture. That committee took up the bill and considered it carefully for something like a week or 10 days and reported it back to the House with an amendment in the form of a substitute. I remember well the long days of hearings we had in the Agricultural Committee last winter, and I know that there are on the Committee on Agriculture both Republicans and Democrats who are anxious to see this legislation enacted. I know that there are Republicans and Democrats in this House who want it. To-day I want to urge upon all who want this kind of legislation to unite their efforts and let us get the Rules Committee to bring in a rule. This bill is here. It has passed the Senate and all we have to do is to take it up in the House, consider it, and pass it. There is only one way to secure this legislation, and that is to take up the Senate bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture, vote down the substitute, pass the Senate bill just as it passed the Senate, and send it to the President of the United States for his signature. Then you will get the legislation that the people of the country want. If you do not do that, if you pursue any other policy, you will not get any legislation. If you adopt the substitute, you simply send the bill to conference and in the 20 days remaining the bill will die. When the new Congress convenes after the 4th day of March you must begin anew in both bodies, introduce other bills, hold additional hearings, and all of the long, laborious work done by the committees of both House and Senate will be thrown away. My purpose this afternoon is to urge that all Members of this House on both sides who are anxious and desirous of securing this legislation get together and bring force to bear on the Rules Committee that they may bring in a rule. What happened on yesterday? We had a rule reported to bring in a bill which was defeated by only one vote under suspension of the rules the day before. One gentleman, a member of the Rules Committee, stated that the vote the day before when the House voted almost two-thirds for the bill was a sufficient reason for the Rules Committee bringing in the rule. I believe a large majority of the House wants this legislation. Impress this fact upon the Rules Committee, and a rule will be forthcoming.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining time, one minute, to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. EVANS of Montana. And, Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the financial statement which the gentleman from Iowa made to the House at the beginning of to-day's session, and particularly his statement that unless appropriations and expenditures of the Government were reduced to less than \$4,000,000,000 that there would be no possibility of reducing taxes which are now upon the statute books from which the people are demanding relief, and that the party responsible for making the appropriations would be held responsible by the people of the country.

There is no reason, in my judgment, why, with the proper exercise of economy and the determination on the part of the Members of Congress, that they will for the time being abandon certain pet projects which are not absolutely necessary to be carried on at this time—I say there is no reason, in my judgment, why the appropriations can not be reduced to a point much less than \$4,000,000,000. It has been more than two years since the signing of the armistice. People are not only expecting but are demanding that the appropriations be reduced and that they be relieved of some of the excessive taxes imposed on them during the war. I think I can promise the Republican majority, who are responsible for the legislation and for the appropriations that are made in this Congress, and also in the next Congress, that in every effort they make toward economy and toward the reduction of expenses they will have the cooperation of the Democratic minority.

I want to say this to the Members upon the Republican side of the Chamber, that if they will follow the advice and leadership of their present able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], there is no question but what these appropriations will be held down to a point that the people may reasonably expect, because I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations with the gentleman from Iowa for the past 10 years, and I say to you that there is no Member of this House who, in my judgment, has shown a greater desire to practice economy, who has shown more courage, more ability, in committee and on the floor of the

House, in his efforts to bring about economy on the part of Congress than has the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD]. [Applause.]

As was stated a while ago, it is not only a question of reducing appropriations, but Congress must make up its mind to cease creating new activities which call for new appropriations.

I was very much gratified a while ago when in response to a question by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE], the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Dr. FESS, a leader of his party on this floor and in the country, made the statement that, so far as he was concerned, he was opposed to the creation of new activities unless they were absolutely necessary. I recall—and I say this with all due respect to the gentleman from Ohio, because I have a warm personal regard for him—that the gentleman has been one of those Members in this House who in times past has been very persistent in his efforts to pass certain legislation, important, useful, and valuable, but possibly not absolutely necessary at the time, which would impose on Congress the necessity of making large appropriations. There are now bills on the calendar from the gentleman's committee which, if passed, will further greatly increase the expenditures of the Government in the sum of hundreds of millions of dollars each year.

About a year ago Congress made appropriations for this fiscal year. The election was approaching and there were very strenuous efforts made by the majority side, particularly by the majority leader, to show that the administration was unduly extravagant and that the Republican majority in Congress was exceptionally economical, and to prove that statement he and others referred to the estimates submitted by the executive departments, denouncing them as extravagant, and compared them with the actual appropriations made.

I charged then that some of the appropriations were being reduced with the knowledge that it would be necessary after the election and at this short session of Congress to come back and get sufficient money with which to carry on the necessary activities of the Government. I charged then that we would find ourselves in the position at this short session of having brought before us a larger deficiency bill than was ever proposed before in Congress in peace times. We are confronted to-day with the first deficiency bill for this session, carrying more than \$200,000,000, a greater amount than has ever been carried in any deficiency bill ever proposed in peace times.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] vouchsafed in his remarks this morning that there were pending before the committee other large estimates for deficiencies, and he intimated that later on during this session, before we adjourn three weeks hence, he would be under the necessity of proposing another large deficiency appropriation bill. This bill carries, as I said, \$203,000,000. Excluding the appropriations for the Army and the Navy, it carries something like \$94,000,000 of deficiencies. It may be true, as the gentleman from Iowa says, that these deficiencies do not occur by reason of reductions made in estimates by Congress at the last session. If that be true, then it is a complete answer to the charge made by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and also by the gentleman from Iowa that the executive departments were unduly extravagant in submitting their estimates. It would show that the administration, in its desire to hold down expenses, submitted estimates which were really not sufficient in amount for the ensuing fiscal year.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not a fact that if the Secretary of War had refused to increase the Army and held it down to the amount appropriated for at the last session of Congress there would not have been a deficiency, so far as the Military Establishment is concerned?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is probably true. I was speaking particularly of the estimates outside of those submitted for the Army. I agree with the gentleman. I am opposed to an Army exceeding 150,000 men, and if I had had my way the Secretary of War would not have enlisted above 150,000 men; but I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact—and the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs—that his own committee reported to this House and Congress passed a bill authorizing an Army of 280,000 men, in round numbers. The Secretary of War was authorized to enlist that size of Army by express authorization of this House. It is true that later on in the same session and within a few weeks Congress undertook to limit it by making an appropriation—

Mr. McKENZIE. But is it not true that that authorization in the reorganization bill said that in peace times the enlisted force of the Army should not exceed 280,000 men? It does not say that it shall be 280,000 men.



Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understand; but it made the authorization.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Illinois can not complain, because he and every member of his party yesterday twice voted not to reduce either the Army or the number of officers in the personnel. They had a chance to do it yesterday, and they voted to keep it up as high as possible in both votes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. On that same question that same bill directed the different branches and departments of the Army to be composed of so and so and directed that they should be so enlisted, making up a total of 280,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I regret that I have not the opportunity to discuss some features of the bill which I intended to discuss, but have not been able to do so in the time allotted me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired. All time has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Valuation of property of carriers: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry out the objects of the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof," by providing for a valuation of the several classes of property of carriers subject thereto, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, \$1,000,000.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman from Iowa how much money has already been appropriated for the valuation of these railroads and how much longer this appropriation will be carried and what the real benefit to be obtained from the same is?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the amount already appropriated, not including the amount carried in the bill, is \$21,050,462. It is supposed that the field work will have been completed with the end of this fiscal year, and that the work of assembling the field notes and completing the valuation will have been completed by the end of this calendar year. Just when the work will be finally completed will depend on what Congress does. The work must continue under the law. Here is what Judge Prouty says with regard to the completion of the work:

The transportation act, as I apply it in my own mind, will require the commission to determine, probably as of December 31, 1921, the value of each individual interstate railroad in this country; and this same transportation act requires the commission to use in the making of that valuation the information collected under the valuation act. It was clearly in the mind of Congress that the figures of the Bureau of Valuation would be available to the commission for the most part by the time it became necessary to use them.

Mr. SNELL. Is it a fact that this valuation changes faster than the people are able to make the valuation under the present system?

Mr. GOOD. No; I think not. Of course, the valuation has changed more rapidly than they could proceed during the war.

Mr. SNELL. I mean as a general proposition, leaving out the war entirely.

Mr. GOOD. That has upset their work to a very large extent, of course. If the valuation of the roads is based only on the cost, you would have one figure, and if it was based on the replacement cost you would have at this time an altogether much larger figure.

Mr. SNELL. And they are doing both.

Mr. GOOD. They are making a valuation, so that both the cost to the railroad companies and the reproduction costs will be known.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. Under the valuation act of 1913 the valuation board of the Interstate Commerce Commission must make a valuation, first, of the original cost; second, of the cost of reproduction; and third, of the cost of reproduction, new, less depreciation, but in view of the decision of the Supreme Court handed down last summer in the Kansas City Southern case, the commission under mandamus proceedings must now make a valuation of the acquisition of lands in addition to the present value, and that decision of the Supreme Court will entail additional expenditure of \$300,000, which could not have been anticipated by Judge Prouty or by Chairman Clark when they appeared before the Committee on Appropriations a year ago in making the estimates.

Mr. GOOD. Answering the gentleman's question a little further, Judge Prouty says:

Now, if I am permitted to proceed as we are now going, I expect to be able to furnish the commission by the end of the present calendar year with these figures as to every railroad, with possibly a few exceptions, of 500 miles or more in extent; but if this deficiency appropriation and our annual appropriation is materially reduced the accomplishment will be nothing as good as that.

Mr. SNELL. Is it expected that these appropriations will have to be continued indefinitely, if you are going to keep up this work, to make them of value?

Mr. GOOD. I should not think it would require anything like the appropriations required before, because a survey has been made, but some appropriation will have to be made if the work is to be kept current.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. In the physical valuation act the commission in doing this valuation work will have to keep current the cost of all additions and betterments and extensions since July 1, 1914, which is the date of the valuation, so that it will not be a very large force to keep current the items of cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman think it is absolutely necessary to continue these appropriations for the good of the commission, of the people, and of the railroads?

Mr. ESCH. There never was a time when this valuation was more necessary in view of the facts contained in the transportation act, namely, that after two years, which will be the 1st of March, 1922, the valuation upon which the Interstate Commerce Commission is to fix rates which will produce the 6 per cent becomes effective, so, according to Judge Prouty's statement, he hopes to make the valuation during the current calendar year.

Mr. SNELL. What have they been doing toward fixing the rate up to the present time?

Mr. ESCH. They made the valuation last March, or rather in April, I think it was, of \$18,900,000,000, based largely upon estimates—tentative valuations which have been filed with them by the valuation board. They also took into consideration the other elements of value referred to in the decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. SNELL. Are those more accurate than the ones they obtained from the railroads themselves?

Mr. ESCH. Yes; those were checked up.

Mr. SNELL. Then the gentleman considers it is absolutely necessary to continue this appropriation?

Mr. ESCH. I do. Unless this valuation is made it will be difficult for the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix the basis for rates.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to get some information about this of the gentleman from Iowa. How long has this physical valuation been going on?

Mr. GOOD. The first appropriation was \$100,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913.

Mr. CARTER. How many men are employed in the physical valuation of the railroads at this time?

Mr. GOOD. I can not state that exactly. We had a complete table in the sundry civil bill hearings—I do not have it before me—giving the entire personnel of the field force and the office force.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The complete list of names and the salaries will appear in the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. GOOD. The same thing was given in the sundry civil hearings.

Mr. CARTER. It may have been stated over there, but the gentleman stated it so low that we could not hear it over here. What time does the gentleman estimate it will take to finish this work now?

Mr. GOOD. Judge Prouty says it will be completed by the end of this calendar year.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, during the discussion of this bill the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] gave some very interesting information relative to the air mail service. In my opinion, if the mail service conducted by air service of the Post Office Department is successful, it will only be a question of time—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not make the point of order against the gentleman, although the gentleman is discussing a matter out of order.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Does the gentleman make the point?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; I am more courteous than the gentleman.

Mr. McCLINTIC. If the gentleman will permit, a post-office item is contained in this bill, and I hope he will not make the point of order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I am not making the point of order.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I thank the gentleman. As I started to say, in my opinion, if the air mail service is successful, it will only be a question of time until it is enlarged similar to the way the Parcel Post System was enlarged, and will ultimately result in a passenger-carrying mail service. A few days ago there was discussed on this floor a very interesting subject, which dealt with a gas which when fully developed will be used, in my opinion, in the passenger carrying service. The gentlemen from Texas [Mr. LANHAM and Mr. PARRISH] gave some very interesting information relative to the utilization of a by-product of natural gas called helium. All of us know that the natural elements above are such that a person operating an airplane is liable to be suddenly confronted with air pockets, wind currents, and changes of temperature. In my opinion, we will never be able successfully to combat the air and its changes until we have developed a machine with a sufficient amount of natural buoyancy which will meet these sudden conditions when necessary. Mr. Chairman, in the question propounded by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN] to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] in regard to helium gas he answered, if my memory is correct, that he was not in favor of allowing private industries to develop this gas, and I want to say to you and to the committee that unless private industries are allowed to develop this natural gas the whole country is liable to suffer. In other words, nothing should be done to retard or hinder those who wish to develop air passenger service.

I am thoroughly of the opinion that if Germany during the recent war had been able to find some gas that was noninflammable and noncombustible that their Zeppelins could not have been brought to the ground when participating in a raid and that country might have won the war. If you will remember, when those Zeppelins were in use that they did more to bring terror to the cities which were bombed than anything ever invented in modern warfare. I am of the opinion that if this Congress withholds or passes any legislation which will prevent private industry from developing helium gas, which is to-day being wasted, that the development of aero passenger service in the future will be seriously retarded. I am hoping that when this subject comes up for consideration at a later date the statements I have made relative to aero passenger service and the development of helium gas will be taken into consideration, so that in the future we may have the benefit of the best brains that can be put forth by private industries to hasten the completion of the discovery of such aero passenger-carrying ships which will be able to meet or combat the natural elements in the air. Helium gas is the only known gas suitable to be used in balloons and passenger-carrying ships that is noninflammable and noncombustible, and its development should not be retarded by legislation.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I do it to discuss briefly the item under consideration. I was a member of the subcommittee that appropriated the first money for the physical valuation of railroads. At that time I took the position which I think is sound; that is, instead of putting out the small number of surveying parties, the Interstate Commerce Commission ought to have been given enough money to have made that physical valuation in as short a time as possible. I think this is a very important piece of work, of course made necessary, as you all know, by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. Now, what I fear about this is that the first valuations made, commencing some years back, will give rise to litigation in the event the Interstate Commerce Commission shall fix the rates based upon a valuation that they made years ago.

There are two difficulties in the way. One is that railroad mileage may have been increased many times since the valuation was made, and another is that the railroad mileage and equipment may depreciate many times and not be worth half what it was. Therefore, I am afraid that this very valuable service will not be as accurate and as beneficial to us as it would have been if we had made the valuation more quickly.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. Sisson. I will.

Mr. SNELL. That is one of the points I wanted to bring out. What value at the present time is the valuation of a railroad that was made eight years ago?

Mr. Sisson. That, of course, is problematical. I can not tell, nor do I believe anyone can tell, what the courts would do

with that question if it was in the courts. It would depend entirely on the testimony as to the change of valuation at the time.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch], in whose opinion I have great confidence, if in his opinion the valuation made some 8 or 10 years ago will be a safe basis for the commission to fix rates upon now?

Mr. Esch. As I understand, the valuation was required to be made of a given date. That was July 1, 1914. The great amount of work done by the valuation board since that time consists of sending engineers over every mile of railroad in the United States and over every mile of telegraph line. They have made a list of the ties and the rails, the cubic feet of fill and—

Mr. Sisson. I am thoroughly familiar with that, because that was all gone over when the appropriation was granted.

Mr. Esch. Now, we have that detail. Then the thing to do is to attach to those elements of valuation the unit of cost, and that they will do when the field work is finished.

Mr. Sisson. That is all true, but I am at a loss to know. I have great confidence in Judge Prouty, but he was not absolutely certain in his testimony a year or two ago as to what valuation the court, or how much value the court, would attach to the valuation made some years ago. In other words, Judge Prouty also believed with the committee—I do not know that the whole commission agreed with him—that the work ought to have been done with more speed and that more surveying parties ought to have been put out for the purpose of making the survey very much quicker.

Mr. Esch. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. Sisson. But the committee differed with us about it. Now, I think this is one of the most important items that we can now consider. What I fear is that it may lead to this sort of litigation: If the rates fixed by the commission should be favorable to the public, it would mean, of course, that the railroads would attack those rates. Now, if they make rates favorable to the railroads, I do not know just who is going to intervene in the interest of the public, because the commission is presumed to represent the public. Therefore the accuracy of the valuation ought to be such that not only the railroads but the public might know that it is a reasonably fair one. A railroad that permits its rolling stock and its tracks to go down may be very much less valuable than a railroad that is continually improving its rolling stock and tracks. I have been at a loss to know how, in the absence of proof on the part of the Government, we would ever be able to meet successfully in any contest or litigation the proof the railroads had advanced as to change of valuation unless they should make a resurvey of the whole matter and of the money lost. I hope, however, that the survey will be—and I think it will be—of great value. And I think the sooner we conclude it the better.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all authorized expenditures under the provisions of the act of February 17, 1911, "to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," and amendment of March 4, 1915, extending "the same powers and duties with respect to all parts and appurtenances of the locomotive and tender," including such stenographic and clerical help to the chief inspector and his two assistants as the Interstate Commerce Commission may deem necessary, and for per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, \$10,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Under this head of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the first paragraph we have appropriated \$500,000 "for all other authorized expenditures necessary in the execution of laws to regulate commerce," and so on, not itemized in any particular. That would embrace almost anything, and I merely mention that to call attention to the loose and intemperate way we still have of appropriating money. And I might add that for these different matters embraced under this head for the present fiscal year we have already appropriated \$1,600,000, and this deficiency of \$500,000 is additional to that sum. In the next paragraph, which is for the "investigation of railroad accidents," we appropriate another deficiency of \$22,400. This sum is in addition to the \$313,600 already carried in the sundry civil bill for this particular paragraph. Then, in the next paragraph, "valuation of railroad properties," we appropriate \$1,000,000 deficiency, and this in addition to the \$1,750,000 already appropriated, practically all of which has been spent during the present fiscal year.

Mr. GOOD. For valuation.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. Now, the present paragraph is for "locomotive inspection," \$10,000, as a deficiency. And the chairman of the committee knows that we have already appropriated, and it has been spent, most of it, \$290,000 under this head for the present fiscal year for such inspection. Now, I



want to show you who it benefits mostly. The people of the United States only indirectly are benefited, but I will show you who it benefits directly.

There is very little testimony given on these items. The hearings on all of them will not cover over two or three pages. But I want to call your attention to the testimony of Mr. Clark, on page 24 of the hearings, with respect to this second paragraph under this head, and for which, as I said, we have already spent \$313,600 and are now appropriating as a deficiency \$22,400 more.

The chairman of the committee was trying to find out how Mr. Clark was spending this money, and asked him the reason for all this. He said:

We have an engineer physicist, who is a very competent man, and he is doing valuable and helpful work—

Valuable and helpful work to the people directly? No. Here is the way in which it was valuable and helpful:

Helpful to the manufacturers of those things and helpful to the railroads.

So Mr. Clark said.

Most of this money that we are spending under these two heads is helpful mostly to the railroads we learn from the testimony of Mr. Clark. I am wondering when we are going to stop it.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that that is helpful, of course, to the railroads and to the manufacturers who are manufacturing safety appliances. But the old safety-appliance law was not enacted for the benefit of the railroads, but it was enacted to lessen the number of injuries to the public.

Mr. BLANTON. I can not yield further; I have but five minutes—

Mr. GOOD. That is too much—

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman has used an hour and a half to-day. It reminds me of a statement I heard not long ago which came directly from an engineer, to show how the people have to pay for these regulatory matters and for certain rules that both the railroads and the employees have for the operation of trains, from which the country suffers daily. The engineer stopped at a little station and found out that there was a bolt loose and lost, that had been lost out of some part of the engine. He had such a bolt in his engine cab box that cost about 8 cents that he could have put in there in three minutes and put it in good, and his engine would have been in first-class shape; but under the rules of his organization he could not touch the bolt, and he could not touch the engine—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. He had to stop that engine and that train full of passengers at that little station, and wire in to the next division, some thirty-odd miles, and have them send an engine and a caboose with two mechanics in it, out there to put a little 8-cent bolt into the engine. The train was delayed four hours and a half, and that one little bolt cost the railroad company an immense amount of money, which the people have to pay in the increased tariffs.

For the inspection of these boilers and the inspection of these tenders and the investigation of these railroad accidents the people are paying these tremendous sums when the railroads themselves ought to do most of it. That is the point I am trying to make. The railroad company, after all, is responsible to individuals for every accident. There are big lines, big systems, that have operated for years and have not had an accident or loss of life for years, and that was true before we ever thought of spending these sums of half a million dollars a year in such investigations. I say this is, most of it, unnecessary. We started that a good while ago. We ought now to retrench on it and stop it. It is not a true deficiency, and we ought to stop spending the money.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I drew and, to use a common expression, "put through" this House what is known as the boiler inspection bill. I did it after a very thorough examination of the subject, even going so far as to crawl into the fire box, with the steam still on in the boiler, where it was pretty hot, to learn how the whole thing was done.

It is to the interest of the railroad company to have boilers that do not explode, but they frequently took the chance, and

boilers did explode. I dare say there has been no one thing done by the Government which has been of more value to the people than the laws in reference not merely to boiler inspection on the railroads, but providing for the inspection of other parts of engines and for the various safety appliances required on the railroads.

All of these propositions were fought by the railroad people. They were all, it is true, largely asked for by railroad labor, but they were passed in the interest of the public, and the expense which the public pays is paid for the benefit of the public; and if they could derive as much benefit in a thousand and one other directions as they do in this direction, how happy I would be!

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For 1918, \$23,603.41.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. Will the chairman of the committee kindly state whether or not this sum, \$23,603.41, is all for items for which there was due authorization of law?

Mr. GOOD. I think there is due authorization of law for all these items. Of course, it is a deficiency. They have expended this money.

Mr. BLANTON. I realize that it is a deficiency, but was it a deficiency that was based upon authority of law? Did they spend the money with due authority of law?

Mr. GOOD. They could not make the payments that would pass the auditor unless there was authority of law for it. I think unquestionably there was authority of law for all the expenditures.

Mr. BLANTON. Did our usually careful chairman look into the matter?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. This has come before us in two ways. Last year it came before us as audited claims. There was a whole bunch of audited claims. They should not have come as audited claims. They were a deficiency. We refused to allow them as audited claims, and they come back now as deficiency appropriations.

Mr. BLANTON. These are not tango items, are they?

Mr. GOOD. I hope not.

Mr. BLANTON. There were some items in the last bill of that kind.

Mr. GOOD. I say that the House, and no Member of the House, had anything to do with these expenditures. They are claims that have come in. They seemed to be regular expenditures. Some of them are in amounts that have been tied up for some time, small claims; and the Government is compelled, as I think the gentleman will understand—

Mr. BLANTON. We had a deficiency bill here less than six or eight months ago. Why should \$23,000 go over from 1913 in a deficiency, and \$55,000 in 1919, and not be covered in the last deficiency bill? We have passed several deficiency bills since these amounts were incurred.

Mr. GOOD. We provided for several deficiency expenditures that took place during the war. They are for postage and telegraphing and cable messages, and things of that kind.

Mr. BLANTON. There is no high society in it?

Mr. GOOD. I can not say as to that. If there is any "high society in it," the Members of the House were not connected with the expenditure; I know that.

Mr. BLANTON. But they are connected with taking the money out of the Treasury to pay for it.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman can well understand that if the Government refused to pay bills that were contracted abroad it would not very long have any credit, even though the gentleman and other Members of the House might question the correctness of making the expenditure. The State Department having entered into the contract and having contracted the indebtedness, Congress can do nothing except pay the bill, even though the State Department may have been unwise in contracting the indebtedness. I do not know whether it was wise or not; but the Government can only maintain its credit at home and abroad by paying its contracts.

Mr. BLANTON. There is one bill that has lately been filed for money already expended. Does the gentleman approve of that?

Mr. GOOD. What is that?

Mr. BLANTON. The million and some odd thousands of dollars, filed for expenses abroad, much of it being social expenses. Does the gentleman approve of that claim?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know the claim the gentleman refers to.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman does not know about it, I will not remind him of it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is it not a fact that when we make up a deficiency appropriation, these deficiency items can not be paid unless they are authorized by law?

Mr. GOOD. That is true.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This does not authorize new expenditures, as I understand it.

Mr. GOOD. Not at all. It is simply to pay bills that have already been contracted.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Under law.

Mr. GOOD. Under law. The auditor has passed these bills, and he could not pass them if they were not authorized by law.

Mr. BEGG. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] withdraw his reservation of the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. I wish to get a little information from the chairman of the committee [Mr. Good], if I may have it. It is on the question of deficiencies in general in the departments. I take it up under this department because I know more about it than I do about any other. When we make a specific appropriation for any item like contingent expenses or salaries of consuls or consular agents, or anything of that kind, what right has the department under the law to spend more than is appropriated, unless it is the moral right to meet an emergency? I should like to have the gentleman's statement on that.

Mr. GOOD. It has no right, except that under the provisions of section 3732 of the Revised Statutes if the expenditure is under an appropriation inadequate for the purchase of clothing, subsistence, forage, fuel, quarters, or transportation in the War Department or the Navy Department, then and in those cases only have the officials the right to create a deficiency.

Mr. BEGG. Then if I understand the gentleman—and I think I do—any expenditure beyond the appropriations, unless we all concede that an emergency arises, by the Department of State or any other department is an absolute violation of law?

Mr. GOOD. There are some modifications of that. The antideficiency law provides that at the beginning of the year there shall be an allotment made by the officer who has the appropriation in charge, and that that allotment shall be by months or quarters, so that there shall be no deficiency in the last quarter. But that is subject to this qualification. I guess I had better read the whole provision—

Mr. BEGG. It is not necessary.

Mr. GOOD. In case the officer finds that in order to efficiently administer a given law he will need more money than the appropriation, then he can waive his allotment, but that waiver must be in writing and submitted to Congress with the reasons therefor, and after that is done then he can create a deficiency.

Mr. BEGG. I understand that, but that is never done, is it?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes; very frequently. It is done in a great many cases.

Mr. BEGG. I have never known it to be done.

Mr. GOOD. It is done in very many instances, and has been done as to many of the estimates for deficiencies in this bill.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If the gentleman from Iowa will pardon me, of course when Congress directs an officer of the Government to do something and he does it and there is no appropriation, that is a legal deficiency.

Mr. BEGG. I understand that absolutely.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Or if we provide for the salary for an office and do not appropriate the money to pay the salary, there is a legal deficiency.

Mr. BEGG. I understand that.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman did not state that.

Mr. BEGG. I understand that.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But where we appropriate for specific purposes, where there is no direction, they can not spend more than that sum without a further appropriation.

Mr. BEGG. Under the item for contingent expenses or emergencies in the State Department we appropriate \$600,000. The gentleman does not hold that that gives them permission to go on and spend \$650,000, does he?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly not.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. In the case in question—

Mr. BEGG. There is no specific case. I am just trying to determine the facts, to see if this body has any check on any department that cares to go ahead and expend beyond the appropriation.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I know the gentleman will be interested in a statement as to how this particular deficiency arose. Accounts are presented after an appropriation

has lapsed, and that is this case according to the hearings. When the accounts were received it was not ascertained what appropriation they belonged to and it was too late to charge them to the exact appropriation to which they did belong.

Mr. BEGG. I was not questioning this specific item. In the last Congress and this two deficiency bills have been brought up. There unquestionably have been emergencies in some and in others there is no emergency, but they go on and spend without any limitation.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Government officials can not spend money because there is an emergency; they are not authorized to do that.

Mr. BEGG. I know that they give that as an excuse.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is not the way deficiencies are created; there must be more than an emergency. Congress acts in the case of an emergency.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman, the chairman of the committee, a question. Whatever became of the provision put in the law several years ago making it a criminal offense for the head of a department to exceed the appropriation?

Mr. GOOD. That is the act of February 27, 1906; that is the one I referred to a moment ago, the antideficiency law.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did anybody ever enforce it?

Mr. GOOD. There have been a great many violations of it. I suppose during the war it was impossible to strictly enforce it. Take the items under discussion; they were created during the war, but they were in excess of the appropriations for those years. To answer the gentleman's question, I do not know of any criminal prosecution or any punishment ever having been inflicted on anyone for creating a deficiency in violation of law.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The war is over, and does not the gentleman think we had better go back and enforce the law henceforth and forever?

Mr. GOOD. I certainly do. If the gentleman from Missouri will look over the hearings, he will find that every person that came before us had his attention called to the antideficiency law, and he was asked why it had not been enforced. The committee has been quite diligent in that respect, not only in this Congress but previous Congresses. I remember when the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] conducted the hearings on the deficiency practically every item that came before him he made the inquiry as to the failure to observe the antideficiency law. We have done it right along. But practically it is an administrative function. Congress can not dismiss a man. Here is a jail sentence provided for as a penalty, as follows:

Any person violating any provision of the act shall be summarily removed and made to pay a fine of \$100 or imprisonment of not less than one month.

I do not know where a single administrative official has ever inflicted a penalty under this provision.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman from Iowa in all probability will have great influence with the incoming administration, and can it not be enforced somehow and in some way?

Mr. GOOD. I think a rather lax method has grown up in all departments with regard to enforcing the antideficiency act.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. FESS. When the attention of these officials was called to the fact that they had violated the law, did they claim that they had not violated the law or did they admit that they had?

Mr. GOOD. Sometimes it was an admission and sometimes they were able to show some reason why it had been done.

The Clerk read as follows:

Distinctive paper for United States securities: For additional amount necessary to complete the purchase of 129,000,000 sheets of distinctive paper for United States currency, national bank currency, and Federal reserve bank currency, including transportation of paper, traveling, mill, and other necessary expenses, \$110,536.87.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What I desire to call the attention of the committee to does not properly come under this item nor the one preceding; but this morning we talked about the possibility of the interest being paid upon foreign loans. I have been noting in the financial dispatches and discussions of financial questions reference to the fact that the foreign loans have never been put in the form of a bond, but simply in the form of a certificate or due bill, and the question was raised whether until these loans were funded there will be any interest to run, indicating that there may be a claim that the interest does not begin until we put the debt in the form of a bond. Has the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations had any information on that point?

Mr. GOOD. The statement was made at one time before the committee a year or so ago that the obligations were in the



form of demand notes. My understanding is that they draw interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum.

I think it was Secretary GLASS who made the statement while he was Secretary of the Treasury that some arrangement had been made whereby the foreign countries would not be called upon to pay the interest for the period of three years. I think that that has been allowed to stand in that way; there was a tentative agreement between this Government and other Governments whose demand obligations we had that our Government would not demand interest until about three years after the signing of the armistice.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman understand that when they do demand it it will be three years' interest, or does interest begin at the end of the three years?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, it was not a waiver of the interest, as I understand it, but only a postponement of the time of payment. The Secretary would not have such authority. If the gentleman is interested in that I refer him to quite a long and full discussion of the matter in the hearings before the committee on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill of this year.

Mr. FESS. I hope the gentleman's view is correct, although it has been mentioned in financial circles that there is no interest due until after the debt is put in the form of a funded debt.

Mr. GOOD. If that was the case there would have been no necessity for an agreement on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury that the payment of interest should be postponed for three years.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I admit the statement. In connection with this I read a statement put out by a New York bank that has some very interesting items in it:

Significant in considering Great Britain's outlook are the figures recently issued by the Savings Banks' Association of the State of New York which show that the British Empire profited more in a monetary way as a result of the war than any other nation, her estimated wealth now being approximately \$230,000,000,000, as compared with \$130,000,000,000 when the war started. This gain of \$100,000,000,000 is attributed to the wealth added by the Mesopotamia oil fields, the African territory taken from Germany, and the elimination of Germany as a trade competitor, and will serve as an important asset in the recovery and extension of foreign trade.

There has been much interest recently developed in our rights in the Mesopotamia oil fields, as the gentleman will recall. I am wondering whether this statement is true, that \$100,000,000,000 represents the additional wealth of one of the Allies, one of our associates in the Great War, and whether there is any real legitimate reason why this interest should not be paid now on the debt that is owing us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of asking a question, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if he does not think it is time for the Government to stop all of this talk that is going on throughout the country to the effect that the United States Government is not going to demand payment for all of these loans due by our allies, and let the people of this country understand, and let the people of all of the foreign countries understand, that the United States Government is going to require them to pay every dollar of loans that we made them during the war? Does not the gentleman think it is time to put a stop to all of this misunderstanding throughout the country?

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman I am afraid is asking me to criticize what the Secretary of the Treasury has done, and I do not want to do that, because I might be accused of being a partisan if I should criticize even the postponement of the payment.

Mr. BLANTON. The time is going to be here in a few days when the gentleman will have to speak for his own Secretary of the Treasury; as to what his own Secretary is going to do.

Mr. GOOD. I hope the time has arrived when we may call upon the countries owing us to pay the interest on their obligations.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa permit me to suggest that possibly there are many elements in connection with that matter?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. For instance, I should think that the honorable Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union would want to know about the effect upon our home markets, judging from a speech which he made not long ago. The question has many elements, and I agree with the gentleman from Iowa that for numerous reasons, not confined to those here given, it ought not to be answered at this time.

Mr. BLANTON. I noticed the other day that one of these countries that owes us quite a lot of money, and that is always

hollering hard times, spent over \$100,000 for a state dance the other night, and if they can waste money in that way they ought to be able to pay the interest on the money that this country let them have in their extremity.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase of file holders and file cases for use of the accounting offices of the Treasury Department, \$3,000.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question in respect to the policy of such items as are contained in this paragraph:

For the purchase of file holders and file cases for use of the accounting offices of the Treasury Department, \$3,000.

What is the necessity for expenditure of \$3,000 for that item?

Mr. GOOD. That is largely for files for checks. The expenditures have been so great and the number of checks drawn upon the Government so large, that the amount appropriated for this purpose has not been sufficient. More than that, the cost has been very much greater. Formerly we appropriated \$6,000 a year, \$4,000 in 1915 and 1916, and then \$5,000. This year we have \$12,000 available. The department does not have containers to put these checks in. Many of these are war-risk checks, and the gentleman can see that it takes almost as many checks for new service as we ordinarily would have for all other purposes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I understand that, but the other departments—the War Department and several commissions and bureaus—had unlimited files and file cases that should have been transferred to the Treasury Department for that purpose. Why was that not done?

Mr. GOOD. These are a box the size of a check and my impression is that they are of pasteboard. The checks are placed in them and filed away. It takes a great many of them, and the file cases used by the War Department in many instances are still being used. They have files in them, and until those files are relieved of all matter that will not be preserved those cases would not be available.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I have been informed that there are in storage houses in certain places in New York thousands and hundreds of thousands of these file cases, desks, and all kinds of office furniture. What is the policy of the Government with regard to that surplus furniture?

Mr. GOOD. Under the law all surplus file cases and furniture are turned over to the General Supply Committee, and when an appropriation is made the department that gets the appropriation must go to the General Supply Committee, and if there is a case or a desk or anything of that kind that is desired, which is in stock, that department pays for it out of that appropriation to the General Supply Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I understand that this \$3,000 will follow that same course?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; but there are no cases of this kind in stock. These are simply pasteboard boxes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hospital construction, Public Health Service: For the completion of hospital buildings in Cook County, Ill., \$400,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, at the end of line 8 there was an amendment asked for by the Public Health Service and also by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds which I have omitted to offer. I ask unanimous consent to return to that for the purpose of offering the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to return to line 8 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 14, after line 8, insert as a new paragraph the following: "The limitation of \$210,000 for technical services, etc., contained in section 10 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines,' approved March 3, 1919, is increased by the sum of \$11,400."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman tell me what is the purpose of that?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. Is that an increase in the limitation?

Mr. GOOD. It increases the limit of cost. The committee refused to give the item because it was legislation. We referred the matter to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. At Dawson Springs, Corpus Christi, and Cook County, Ill., where the inspectors and assistant inspectors are doing work the department does not have enough within the limitation to pay for the inspectors. They say they will have to discharge their inspectors and the work will have to go on without inspectors unless this increase in the limit is permitted. It does not carry

an appropriation, but increases the limit of expenditure for inspection by \$11,400. The matter was presented to the committee and the department asked for it, but the committee felt that it was not a deficiency in that sense and yet the committee did feel that perhaps a great deal more money would be saved by keeping the inspectors doing inspection work rather than take them off their jobs. I understand the Building and Grounds Committee want it inserted in the bill.

Mr. GARRETT. If the gentleman will yield, this is really a limitation on a statutory act.

Mr. GOOD. It increases the limitation by \$11,400.

Mr. GARRETT. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

**PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OPERATING EXPENSES.**

Operating force: For such personal services as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary in connection with the care, maintenance, and repair of all public buildings under the control of the Treasury Department, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, \$12,000.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Iowa. I have read the hearings on this particular item, and, as I understand, it gives, on page 225 of the hearings, a list of the towns where it is intended to put in additional watchmen. Is that the understanding?

Mr. GOOD. We give none of them. It was for an increase in the number of watchmen and in other places, and also an increase of salaries—

Mr. WINGO. I understand that is right. It is to increase the salaries and to increase the number of watchmen in the cities.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. The reason I ask about it is this: In the city of Fort Smith the custodian there, who is the postmaster, received instructions to close the building unless he had a labor watchman which he has not now. Well, you can not close the building. It would be folly to do it. You have not only the post office there, a very large post office, growing very rapidly, but you also have the United States court there; you have the revenue headquarters there; you have the prohibition-enforcement officers there; you have the civil-service secretary force there; you have the post-office inspection headquarters there; you have the Weather Bureau there; you have the district judge of the United States, whose personal office is in that building; you have the United States district attorney; you have the home office of the United States marshal; you have a good many people who are necessarily in there at night a good deal. Now, when the question was asked, because you can not close the building up, why he gave the order if he did not have a labor watchman, the official responsible immediately put the blame on Congress, that the Congress will not appropriate, and therefore there is not enough money. Now, I presume from the hearings they did not make any request for any additional watchmen for cities that have no watchmen at the present time but those which have had them heretofore, and the excuse he gave, recognizing the necessity for the watchman there, was that he could not do this with the appropriation, because Congress did not give enough money. That is not exactly a candid excuse to give to the postmaster.

Mr. GOOD. No; I think not. But I will say to the gentleman in 1915 they had \$2,650,000 for this purpose, and for this year they have \$3,700,000 and asked for \$845,000 additional. Now, all we gave them was this. We did not give that amount to increase their force or to increase the pay. To have given that would be to increase the allowance by 100 per cent since 1915, which we have not done in any other service in the field. That we did not feel was a deficiency, but they did require, as stated, \$12,000. There was a deficiency in their regular force at the end of the year of \$12,000, and we gave them that.

Mr. WINGO. My position is this: I recognize the position of the committee, and what I say is not in criticism of the committee, but there are special reasons which there is no use in going into; but the prime reason for the order which was given is that a danger is now present in that building at Fort Smith because of the headquarters of certain elements in a town not far away from there, so there is a present danger which should be guarded against. Now, the only excuse which is given is not that a watchman is not needed, not that there is no danger there, but that Congress will not let them have enough money. He says we do not appropriate enough to pay persons to be watchmen, and therefore Congress is to blame if that building is destroyed or its property stolen, or its doors are broken open, or whisky is stolen—

Mr. MADDEN. What is whisky doing there?

Mr. WINGO. I do not know that it is stored there; I think there are Liberty bonds, revenue stamps, and other things stored there. The place to take care of it is on the sundry civil bill, and this is a deficiency bill, but I simply wanted to protest against the statement, where Congress is trying to economize, of simply saying to the custodian that the reason we can not meet a public necessity is because Congress is too penurious and will not give us sufficient funds. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

**PAY OF THE ARMY.**

For pay of the Army, including the same objects, except mileage, specified under this head in the Army appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, \$24,000,000.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to ask the chairman a question. I would like to ask him how they could make such a mistake in the pay of the Army as to have a deficiency of \$24,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. The amount requested for this deficiency was \$40,000,000. The appropriation was made for an Army of something less than 170,000 men—just how much less I could not tell the gentleman. I think the officials of the department do not agree as to that, but it was something less than 175,000 men. Now, we have at present about 240,000 men in the Army, and this estimate of \$40,000,000 was made on the theory that there would be an average during the year of 227,650 men. Now, when the matter was under discussion, the question was asked:

How much can you get along with for the pay of the Army for the rest of this year if the resolution reducing the size of the Army to 175,000 men shall pass?

And it was stated if that resolution passed by the 1st of February they could get along with about \$24,000,000. We have carried that in the bill.

Mr. SNELL. And this is simply because they enlisted a larger Army than Congress authorized?

Mr. GOOD. Largely so. Practically that is what it is for.

Mr. GARRETT. Not than Congress authorized.

Mr. GOOD. Larger than Congress appropriated for.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I wish to suggest to the gentlemen who have just been on the floor that it seems unfair for the charge to be repeatedly made here that the Secretary of War enlisted more men in the Army than were authorized. Gentlemen frequently go down to the departments seeking information, and come back with the charge that everybody down there is "passing the buck," by which is meant they are placing the responsibility somewhere else. This seems to me a plain case in which Congress is "passing the buck" to the Secretary of War. All of us know that in the Army reorganization act we authorized by law 280,000 men to be enlisted. Now, it is true that in the appropriation act for 1921 for the Army it was provided, so gentlemen say, that the appropriation should be for only 175,000 men. In all fairness I submit that an examination of that appropriation act will disclose that Congress simply made a lump-sum appropriation. There is nowhere in that act any legislative limitation to the effect that for that fiscal year the appropriation should be limited to the payment of 175,000 enlisted men. The Secretary of War had no more right to assume that by merely appropriating that lump sum this Congress intended to limit the amount to the payment of 175,000 men than any other head of a department had the right to assume that Congress would not grant a deficiency appropriation when the head of that department should come before the Appropriations Committee. You may take the present bill. What is this bill which we hold in our hands and which we are considering here to-day? It is a deficiency bill, carrying deficiencies for practically every branch of this Government. The heads of the departments knew when you appropriated last year for their various departments that when they came back here and made out a case you would appropriate a deficiency for them, and it is unfair, I submit in all candor, to try to pass the responsibility from the House to the Secretary of War.

I do not want a big Army. I voted, when the Army reorganization bill was before this House, to fix the strength of the Army at a maximum peace strength of 175,000 men, and those of us on the Democratic side of the House pleaded with the majority to fix that as the maximum strength of the Army. But gentlemen on the Republican side of the aisle insisted on fixing the maximum strength of the Army in time of peace at 280,000 men, and because the Secretary of War took your words to mean what they said and went ahead with recruiting, and because he happened to recruit above 200,000, you fill the air with your complaints, and with your recriminations, and with your accusations against the Secretary of War for doing what



you had authorized him by statute law to do. I voted to reduce the Army the other day to 175,000 men, but, in all candor and all fairness, it seems to me Congress ought to admit its own fault when it makes that fault, and acknowledge that it did a foolish thing when it fixed the size of the Army at 280,000 men.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HUSTED. In all fairness, do you not think that the authorization, which, of course, is not a direction at all, was limited by the appropriation?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not.

Mr. HUSTED. Has not that been the practice in the past? The Army in the past has not been enlisted up to its full strength. That is a mere authorization for a maximum number of soldiers in the Army, and when Congress appropriates for two-thirds of that number it does seem to me that a fair interpretation of that appropriation would be to construe it as a limitation upon the authorization and keep the number down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Lack of time precludes me from replying to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] asked the chairman of the committee, in charge of the bill, how was it that the War Department could make a mistake of \$24,000,000 with reference to the pay of our men in the Army. I want to ask a question of the chairman that is a little more apropos, and that is, How could the great, distinguished chairman of this committee make a mistake of more than \$24,000,000 with respect to the pay of our Army in appropriating only \$24,000,000 in this bill as a deficiency? The gentleman knows that for the men we have already recruited, whether the Secretary of War did it lawfully or unlawfully—I do not approve of his doing it; but no matter how he did it, he did it—that for the men we already have in this Army there will be a deficiency on June 30, 1921, of at least \$50,000,000, and maybe \$70,000,000, instead of \$24,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no.

Mr. BLANTON. Why does he take two bites at a cherry here? Why does he not come in and appropriate enough money to meet that deficiency at one time and not take it by piecemeal?

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. GOOD. Now, Gen. Lord was asked the question that if the resolution, which was pending, and which has passed, became a law before the 1st of February this year how much he would need instead of the \$40,000,000. They asked for only the \$40,000,000.

He said they would need \$24,000,000, and that the average size of the Army for the year would be 208,797 men. Now, it is very possible that because this resolution did not become a law until the 6th or 7th of February this amount will not be quite enough. But the gentleman is mistaken; there will not be very much more; there can not be very much more.

Mr. BLANTON. The great chairman of this committee is no fool; he knows what the facts are down here; he is a sensible man, of good financial judgment, and he knows that with 240,000 men already in the Army and a Secretary of War who will not turn one soldier loose unless you use a sledge hammer on him—he knows that by June 30 next of this year we shall have a deficiency of at least \$50,000,000. Does the gentleman say we will not appropriate any more money than \$24,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. I will not. Now I will ask the gentleman a question. If the Secretary of War should continue, in violation of this law, which I do not think he will—if he should continue to enlist men—

Mr. BLANTON. He has stopped that; but we have already got 240,000 men.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Secretary will not be in office 30 days longer.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the distinguished gentleman from Illinois will prevail upon the new Secretary of War after March 4 to turn some of these boys loose and let them go home—these boys who are now in the Army, who were enlisted through the misrepresentations of sleek-tongued recruiting sergeants—and let them go home, because they want to go home.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If he had as good judgment as the gentleman from Texas and myself, he would let a lot of them go.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I agree with much that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has said about the criticism of the Secretary of War. When my friend from

New York [Mr. SNELL] asked whether or not it has been the custom prior to this time to have an authorized strength and then to appropriate for a smaller Army, I must say that has been the custom, and it has also been the custom for the Secretary of War to cause a deficiency in this appropriation for every year back to 1900.

Now, my good friend from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] said the other afternoon that we could not prosecute the Secretary of War. He shows in that statement a wonderful and rare restraint. He would not prosecute the Secretary for recruiting the Army above 175,000, because he knew that it was not a violation of the law. He knows that as to the pay of the Army the Secretary of War can create a deficiency. The gentleman has shown the same restraint on other occasions, because, as was shown by the gentleman from Montana to-day, there has been a deficiency under this item nearly every year for the last 20 years. From 1900 to 1913, a period of 13 years, there were 18 deficiency bills carrying deficiency appropriations under this item of "Pay of the Army." I do not think the gentleman criticized Secretary Root, and yet during his term as Secretary of War there was a deficiency for pay of the Army every year; and as to Secretary of War Taft, I know that the gentleman showed the same rare restraint and did not prosecute, or offer to prosecute, Secretary of War Taft; and I know when Mr. Dickinson was made Secretary there was a deficiency, and an estimate was sent to Congress and the money was voted with absolutely no criticism.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. What was the size of that deficiency as compared with this?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. In 1900 it was \$14,900,000, and \$14,900,000 was some money at that time.

Mr. GOOD. That was about the time when we were having considerable trouble along the Mexican border, was it not?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No. It was after the Spanish-American War, when the conditions were similar to those which exist after this recent war.

Mr. GOOD. I understood the gentleman to say it was in 1914.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. According to the ideas of the gentleman from Iowa, there must have been trouble along the Mexican border from 1900 up to 1914, if that is the explanation of the deficiencies.

Mr. GOOD. I understood the gentleman to say in 1914.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No. Under Secretary of War Taft and Secretary of War Root, and under every man who has occupied the position of Secretary of War deficiencies have been incurred under pay of the Army, and Congress has appropriated the money without criticism; but only now, when Secretary of War Baker incurs a deficiency, have we heard criticisms.

Mr. GOOD. The criticisms are mostly from the gentleman's side of the House.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No. The criticism has come mostly from the gentleman's side, and the gentleman's leader, Mr. MONDELL, with rare restraint, said he would not prosecute the Secretary of War.

Mr. MADDEN. He is a very modest man.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, we are appropriating in the Army bill just passed for only 150,000 men, and yet on the motion to recommit, which showed we are only making an appropriation for 150,000, the Members on the majority side voted against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I just want to move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GOOD. In answer to the gentleman from Texas, I said that Gen. Lord had said that he would need only \$24,000,000. I think perhaps I have misstated the case somewhat, and I want to correct my statement. In a letter written to the chairman of the committee on January 18, Gen. Lord said:

I have had a most careful study made of this matter and am convinced that if the strength of the Army be so restricted from the date indicated, namely, February 1, 1921, the amount required to meet the deficiency in "Pay of the Army" will not exceed \$25,000,000.

And so the committee felt there was some leeway there, and so we put \$24,000,000 in the bill, assuming that perhaps that would be sufficient.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

It is rather interesting and entertaining to listen to the efforts of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the

gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] to defend the Secretary of War, who has the reputation in the State from which he hails as being the leading pacifist in our country. So far as I am concerned, and so far as the people at large are concerned, there is absolutely no excuse for such a deficiency as he has produced in the War Department in the face of the circumstances. Trying to shift the burden from one place to another does not make any difference, and the people are not interested whether you place it on this side or the other side.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I can not now. The deficiency was created in the face of conditions under the like of which no Secretary of War ever created a deficiency before. That was a simple mandate from this body, which from the standpoint of creating the size of the Army is both the legislating and the appropriating power. That mandate simply limited the size of the Army under the possibility of an emergency. I think gentlemen on that side of the House find themselves in a rather embarrassing position. The facts are that Mr. Baker wants to bring into disrepute the whole Military Establishment. He does not want an Army of even 100,000 men, because he is a confessed and rank and open pacifist. We all know what he wants; and in order to satisfy a little pique and to bring disfavor on the whole Army he takes advantage of a technicality—if it is a technicality. The biggest reason he can possibly have is a lawyer's technicality and not a layman's reason.

Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee. The gentleman brings a rather serious charge against the Secretary of War.

Mr. BEGG. I think he deserves it.

Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman know that in the recommendations he has made up here and in the action taken in making these enlistments he has acted in accord and in cooperation with the Chief of Staff and all the Army officers, who certainly are not anxious to bring the Army into disrepute?

Mr. BEGG. It does not make any difference to me, and I question the statement of the gentleman. I do not question the gentleman's veracity, but I question the accuracy of his statement when he says Secretary Baker is acting in accord with all the Army officers. Now, the gentleman knows that every military man would have an army of 500,000 or 1,000,000 men if he could get them; but the gentleman also knows that the American people in peace times do not want an Army of 175,000 or 200,000 men; and what is more, we are not going to have it. And I think, so far as I am personally concerned, there can not be too harsh criticism laid at the door of the Secretary of War. I for one absolutely hold him responsible for the condition. I voted last spring for the bill creating the Army, and every other man in the House who voted for it did so with the distinct understanding that there was a possible elasticity in the law, put there to meet an emergency, that elasticity amounting to 100,000 men, and it was fully understood that no Secretary of War would take advantage of that technicality. I grant the technicality; but you gentlemen who are eminent lawyers know that the intent of the lawmakers has much to do in determining the meaning of the law before the courts, and nobody could stand up and defend Mr. Baker in putting his interpretation on the law.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I suppose a little contribution to the ideas on this subject will not do anybody any harm.

I think the funniest combination I have ever heard of is Secretary Baker and Gen. March, Chief of Staff. One has no use for an Army of fighting men, but wants to educate all the poor people in the world and make every illiterate a scientist and every farmer boy a mechanic. The other has no use for literacy, but wants everybody to be a fighter; and between the two, like Jack Spratt and his wife, they have licked the platter clean. [Laughter.]

I have no criticism of Secretary Baker for increasing the enlisted force of the Army, though I think he possibly deserves some censure for paying no attention to the evident wish of Congress; but I think the fault largely is on the part of Congress itself. [Applause.] I am going to chide my side of the House, even if I am applauded by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] alone. [Laughter.] Our side of the House having just charged that Secretary Baker was in effect violating the will of Congress, if not the law of Congress, by enlisting a force exceeding 175,000 men, which we had appropriated for, we turn right around and appropriate for an Army of 150,000 and refuse to limit it to that. And if the new Secretary

of War should get under the influence of the Army clique during his first year of administration, that side of the House will criticize him. I do not know whether the Army clique will get the new Secretary during the first three months or the first year. They will get him if he stays in office for four years, because that is human nature. [Laughter.] If he keeps up an enlisted force above 150,000 men, the Democratic side of the House will be abusing him next year, just as this side of the House are now abusing Secretary Baker, when both Secretaries in the main are under the direction of the Chief of Staff. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TRANSPORTATION OF THE ARMY AND ITS SUPPLIES.

For transportation of the Army and its supplies, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the Army appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, \$1,932,000.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The other day when we were passing the Army bill and we had under consideration the item for transporting troops I noted that we appropriated \$33,800,000 for that purpose. I do not know how much we appropriated last year for transportation of troops, but under this item we have a deficiency appropriation of \$1,932,000.

On last Saturday I put into the Record the cost of the removal of troops from Camp Funston to Camp Pike and Camp Meade on December 1, the freight and passenger expense of which was over \$600,000. These troops had been taken to Camp Funston within a year. Thousands of dollars had been expended at Camp Funston for their comfort and convenience, and a few months afterwards they were taken to other camps at an expense of \$600,000 to the taxpayers.

I am advised that at Camp Meade, to which most of them were taken, they are now uncomfortable and soon we will have requests for additional quarters to house them. It does seem that some action should be taken to limit the amount of money that the War Department can spend for the transportation of troops. They send troops from one end of the world to another, keep them a few months, and then bring them back again. There is no end to the amount that they can expend. It does seem to me that there should be legislation limiting the amount of money to be expended for the transportation of troops, so as to stop this unreasonable expense of the people's money?

Mr. MADDEN. What line would the gentleman draw as to how much money could be expended for that purpose?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I would say that the men should not be transferred until they had remained at a particular station two or three years.

Mr. MADDEN. But suppose an emergency should arise after they had been there one day, what would the gentleman do?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. There was no emergency that arose for taking the troops away from Camp Funston, and there is no emergency now anywhere for sending men to Siberia, then to the Philippine Islands, and then to Hawaii, all within a year.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would not a provision be sufficient, in the gentleman's opinion, providing that no troops should be taken away from Camp Funston? [Laughter.]

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. No; but I hate to see hundreds of thousands of dollars spent for no other purpose than to place the troops in southern camps.

Mr. BLANTON. There are two ways of stopping it: One is to limit the appropriation, and the other is to limit the places to which they may come and go. We are trying to cut off two places—Camp Funston and Camp Dodge.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. But you are not trying to cut off Camp Meade and Camp Pike.

Mr. BEGG. Can this be controlled in any other way than by a proper action taken by the War Department? And will not that be done after the 4th of next March?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I do not know, but it seems to me that there ought to be a limit on the amount that the War Department can expend for that purpose in the time of peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the word "the" in line 24, page 16. Should not that be "this"?

Mr. GOOD. It should, and I offer that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the word "the," line 24, page 16, will be changed to "this."

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### PANAMA CANAL.

For civil government of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, \$24,670.



Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This bill provides for a deficiency appropriation of more than \$24,000 for the expense of the operation of the Panama Canal. The Panama Canal is one of the greatest financial liabilities possessed by the United States. It is a liability to the extent of anywhere from \$13,000,000 to \$20,000,000 a year. That is, if you count the interest on the investment, the cost of construction, and expense of operation. The Panama Canal cost approximately \$460,000,000. At 3 per cent that is between \$13,000,000 and \$14,000,000 annually.

According to the daily report of the Treasurer of the United States as of June 30, 1920, it shows the loss incurred in the operation of the Panama Canal for the current year as \$6,000,000. The loss in operation for the previous year was \$5,000,000. That added to the investment would make the operating expenses and overhead charges of the Panama Canal something like \$20,000,000 a year.

In reading the report of the Secretary of the Treasury I found on one of the pages a paragraph which gave a different expense account. It stated that the loss incurred in the operation of the Panama Canal for the fiscal year of 1920 was \$455,000, making a difference between the statement as it appeared in the report and the report as issued by the Treasurer of the United States approximately \$5,000,000. I wrote and asked the Secretary why this difference existed, and the reply which I received was not very enlightening. It appears that each year there are book accounts which do not appear in the daily operating expenses. Now, this is what I want to impress on the Congress: The Panama Canal, no matter whether the deficiency is \$13,000,000 a year or \$20,000,000 a year, is being operated by us at a tremendous financial loss.

There may be some military advantage in our owning the Panama Canal, and to what extent that offsets the financial liability I am not able to state, but it seems to me that the tolls on the Panama Canal should be increased. This afternoon we have been talking about our deficiencies. The tolls on the vessels which go through the Panama Canal should be increased so as to make it self-sustaining. We built that canal, and yet other nations use it more than we use it ourselves. Thirty-two per cent of the tolls which went through the canal last year were from the United States and 38 per cent from Great Britain. The other 30 per cent was paid by the other countries of the globe. The canal is advantageous to the people of the whole world as well as to the United States, but we have to pay the price of operation. The tolls on all vessels that go through the Panama Canal should be increased so as to bring us a revenue of \$25,000,000 a year instead of something like six or seven million dollars a year.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNBAR. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman in that connection care to give us his opinion as to whether American coastwise vessels should be permitted to pass through the canal free of toll?

Mr. DUNBAR. If we have a treaty with Great Britain which we entered into, that treaty should be observed, and our vessels should be made to pay toll in accordance with that treaty, but in any event the toll should be increased so as to make the canal self-sustaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this item does not involve tolls. It has nothing to do with the expense of the canal.

Mr. DUNBAR. I am aware of that, but it is an appropriation for the canal.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I shall not object, but I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Chairman, I am aware that this item of \$24,000 has nothing to do with the tolls on the Panama Canal, but I deem it appropriate inasmuch as the chairman of our committee and other members of the committee have this afternoon been discussing the revenues of our Government. Here is an opportunity where they may be increased to the extent that these deficiencies may be reduced and the taxes on other items reduced.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNBAR. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Is there any other source of revenue at all except through the tolls?

Mr. DUNBAR. The item as it appears in the daily report of the Treasury is for tolls, and "so forth." I do not know what the "so forth" means, but the only item that is considered as of sufficient importance to mention is the item of tolls.

Mr. FESS. We have several towns of some significance in the Canal Zone and a railroad. Is there any other source of revenue besides the toll?

Mr. DUNBAR. I do not know.

Mr. FESS. Another question I wanted to ask the gentleman, and I am asking for information purely, is this: Is there any other outlay except for the operation of the canal?

Mr. DUNBAR. The outlay mentioned in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury last year stated over \$3,000,000 was spent for fortifications.

Mr. FESS. What about the cost of schools and other items that usually go with municipalities? Is that an item of cost to the Government?

Mr. DUNBAR. If the cost of the schools is a liability on account of the Panama Canal, then the vessels that use the Panama Canal should also pay that liability.

Mr. FESS. Is that a cost on the Government of the United States?

Mr. DUNBAR. It is a cost on the Government.

Mr. FESS. I agree with the gentleman that there ought to be some way by which the canal must be made nearer self-supporting.

Mr. DUNBAR. My only object in bringing this before the committee to-day is in order that the Ways and Means Committee may take cognizance of the fact that the Panama Canal, used by the whole world, is being paid for by the people of the United States, and I submit that it should not be so and that the tolls should be raised in order that the operation may be made self-sustaining.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to pay from the appropriation "Pay, miscellaneous," for the fiscal year 1919, the sum of \$57.96 to the Virginian Pilot Publishing Co. and \$65.06 to the Ledger Dispatch Corporation, both of Norfolk, Va., for their services in advertising for laborers during the week commencing December 15, 1918.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. These are two small items that seem to have gone over since 1918. What authority of law is there for them?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the situation in regard to these two small advertising bills is this: They have the authority of law to advertise. They must advertise for purchases, but they must first get the direct order from the head of the department. They inserted these advertisements and subsequently got the order. Therefore, not having had the order to insert the advertisements before they were inserted, the auditor held up the claim.

Mr. BLANTON. These two items are not anything like the Chicago newspaper items that the gentleman provided for immediately after the return from that city?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no; the item the gentleman refers to was inserted in the bill over a year ago with respect to the Chicago newspapers.

Mr. BLANTON. I understand; but I refer to the visit that the gentleman made there, when he was so royally entertained.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no; the gentleman is entirely mistaken about that.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4205) to amend section 4, chapter 1, of Title I, of an act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900, as heretofore amended by section 2 of an act entitled "An act to amend section 86 of an act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, to provide for additional judges, and for other judicial purposes," approved March 3, 1909, and for other purposes, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KELLOGG, Mr. BRANDEGEE, and Mr. WALSH of Montana as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 186) to extend the authority of the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge over the North Branch of the Susquehanna River from the city of Wilkes-Barre, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Dorranceton, county of Luzerne, Pa.

The message also announced that the Senate having proceeded in pursuance of the Constitution to reconsider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 440) entitled "Joint resolution directing the Secretary of War to cease enlisting men in the Regular Army of the United States except in the case of those men who have already served one or more enlistments therein," returned to the House of Representatives by the President of the United States with his objections, and sent by the House of Representatives to the Senate with the message of the President returning the joint resolution;

*Resolved*, That the joint resolution do pass, two-thirds of the Senate agreeing to pass the same.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 578) providing for the survey of public lands remaining unsurveyed in the State of Florida, with a view of satisfying the grant in aid of schools made to said State under the act of March 3, 1845, and other acts amendatory thereof.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution (S. Res. 441):

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. FRED L. BLACKMON, late a Representative from the State of Alabama.

*Resolved*, That a committee of six Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed by the House of Representatives to take order for the superintending of the funeral of Mr. BLACKMON at Anniston, Ala.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

#### DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval training station, Great Lakes: Maintenance of naval training station: For labor and material, and so forth, including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, \$62,000.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in line 4, page 23, I move that the sum of \$62,000 be increased to \$100,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 4, strike out the figures "\$62,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$100,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that on a deficiency bill only such amounts as are real deficiencies are in order, and that the gentleman's amendment is out of order, because there is no such deficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not entertain that, because the Chair is not yet advised, and overrules the point of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, my friend is entirely in error in this instance, and I desire to explain to the committee just why I am making this motion. When Capt. Williams, of the Bureau of Navigation, was before the Committee on Appropriations he was questioned about the cost of coal and the necessity for a deficiency appropriation at Great Lakes. The original estimate for the Great Lakes was \$198,000. It was prepared by the commandant of the Great Lakes training station and submitted through the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts of the Navy Department. The Secretary of the Navy in his desire for economy arbitrarily reduced that amount to \$100,000, and that was the way the deficiency estimate reached the Committee on Appropriations. In questioning Capt. Williams about the coal contract and the price of coal at the Great Lakes it was suggested that coal was cheaper now than it was last year, which is very true. The captain did not understand the contract conditions of purchase of coal at the Great Lakes, and before the committee got through with him they figured out that they could reduce this appropriation by \$38,000, based on the estimated reduced price of coal. It is purely problematical.

Some gentleman on the committee was a coal man and suggested that coal really was cheaper now, which is true, but it develops after the reduction was made by the Committee on Appropriations that a contract existed for the purchase of coal at Great Lakes which permits the contractor to deliver up to but not exceeding 75,000 tons and the date of the expiration of that contract is April 1. All of the coal necessary at Great Lakes for a number of months subsequent to April 1 will soon be in their bins and, of course, will have to be paid for, so that the Committee on Appropriations was in error in making the \$38,000 reduction. Let me suggest to the committee that if the Great Lakes station is expected to operate under a deficiency appropriation of \$62,000, the fire-fighting force at that place—and we have got there \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 worth of buildings of temporary wooden construction—that the civilian fire-

fighting force at Great Lakes will have to be discharged and a fire-fighting force made up of enlisted personnel substituted. We will have to detail enlisted personnel to the boiler rooms doing fireman's duty. We have 10 or 12 heating plants at that station. Gentlemen will recall that that station was developed in the course of the war and to meet the necessity for men in the Navy and merchant marine, which had become apparent. We had some 52,000 boys at Great Lakes at one time. It was one of the greatest naval stations the world has ever known. The result is that with its mushroom growth it developed a number of heating plant units, some 16 of them. Now we can not possibly take care of the station unless we have a proper civilian personnel. In other words, if, through lack of funds, we have to discharge them, we may have to take boys out of the training schools and put them in the engine room, put them on the garbage plant, the crematories, the filtration plant, and that is not what the enlisted personnel is expected to do, and no Member of Congress desires to have them do that character of work which takes them out of school. We have two of the most important schools in the Navy established at Great Lakes. We have the greatest ground aviation school there, which now accommodates probably 5,200 boys undergoing training which requires some seven or nine months. We have an excellent radio school there. Now, no one will contend for a moment in the interest of economy that those boys should do ordinary civilian labor, and yet if this appropriation goes through at \$62,000 that is exactly what will have to be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman think that is a pretty good training for the young fellows, after all?

Mr. BRITTEN. That is not the kind of training they go into the Navy for.

Mr. BLANTON. We fellows who live in Washington and maintain residences have to fire furnaces, attend to the garbage can, and attend to the ashes every morning. It is pretty good training, after all.

Mr. BRITTEN. I will not agree with the gentleman that it is good training.

Let me suggest that in the estimate prepared by the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts for \$198,000 for this station as a deficiency estimate, \$25,000 was intended to care for the repair of barracks. Those temporary buildings will last from 15 to 20 years if given reasonable care. If they are allowed to go into decay they will not last five years. I maintain it is economy at an institution of that kind to properly protect those temporary structures. After all, they are only temporary, because in the course of 15 or 20 years, as I have said, we will have to renew them. Twenty-five thousand dollars for garbage disposal is desired in this estimate and \$3,000 for instruction at radio school—and these reliable estimates are made up by the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts—\$88,000 because of the increased cost of coal over last year, \$15,000 for steam-pipe covering—and that is an important item; any man who owns a building knows that that saves fuel—\$4,000 for the fire fighting and for the filtration plant, \$20,000 for the repair of roofs, and \$15,000 is scattered over miscellaneous expenditures, making a total of about \$198,000.

Now, the Secretary of the Navy cut that amount in two arbitrarily, saying that they might get along with \$100,000. As I suggested to the commandant, maybe they can get along with \$100,000 by proper economy and by having a company of the boys at the station doing certain maintenance work on the premises. During the war, when we had 50,000 boys up there, there were several companies known as construction troops. They repaired pipes and did steam fitting, electric wiring, carpentry work, plumbing, road work, and all kinds of construction work. That was a good thing, and I suggested to Capt. Wurtsbaugh that he do that very thing now, only on a smaller basis, in order to meet the wishes of Congress for economy. And that is going to be done. But, gentlemen, Great Lakes can not live the balance of this fiscal year on \$62,000 if the original request for \$198,000 was at all consistent. And it simply means this, that they will have to discharge all of their civilian personnel, and take boys out of school, out of the radio schools and out of the aviation and other schools, and put them at doing civilian work, handling garbage, coal, and making repairs on roads and on buildings. Take a youngster away from mechanical work and set him at carpentry or repair work that he is not qualified to do is not economy. It interferes with his instruction. That is not what he is there for.



I hope the chairman will allow this appropriation to be raised to at least \$100,000, which I am certain is economical and will be used to good advantage.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague, Mr. CHINDBLOM, is greatly interested in the Great Lakes station and would have offered this amendment if he were here to-day. He is at home suffering with a bad case of la grippe. He received this night letter from Great Lakes, which I would like to read for the information it contains:

GREAT LAKES, ILL., February 7, 1921.

HON. CARL R. CHINDBLOM,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Under existing coal contract, station is required to obtain its supply of coal from contractor up to 75,000 tons, unless contractor fails to make deliveries. Present prospects are that contractor will deliver all coal required. If he does, this coal for the year will cost \$75,400 more than last year. Increase over last year is due, first, to largely increased population of station; and second, to poorer quality of coal; and third, to increased price over last fiscal year. Other items which have increased cost of maintenance of station this year are garbage removal, for which the cost per ton is greater than under existing contract, and the quantities are greater, due to doubled population; the cost of maintaining the regimental barracks, such as the cleaning gear in galleys and barracks; the increased cost of equipment for instruction purposes for the greater number of men under instruction. All these are chargeable to maintenance, Naval Training Station, and will raise the cost of this maintenance to at least \$100,000 more than the appropriation. In addition to these increased demands, the Bureau of Yards and Docks expresses opinion that that bureau should not pay for electric current purchased from public-service corporation used in lighting the station and furnishing power, even although that bureau originally approved the requisition for this current under the appropriation "Maintenance, yards and docks." Should it be decided that the appropriation for maintaining the training station should pay for electric current, an additional deficiency appropriation of \$60,000 is imperatively needed, and unless provided the commandant sees O. K. to retain any part of the civilian force attached to the station for the balance of the fiscal year; that is, those paid from appropriation for maintaining the station, which includes power plant and fire-fighting forces, a large part of clerical force, and other employees who have been on the station for many years and whose retention is considered essential to effect operation. Commandant must take action very soon in dismissing civilians unless deficiency appropriations, amounting to \$160,000, are made available quickly. Otherwise, balance available for maintaining the station would not be sufficient to purchase coal and other necessities.

GREAT LAKES.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am not so much interested in the gentleman's suggestion about the boys not being sent there for the purpose of firing boilers, and I can not really catch his viewpoint as to that any more than I can catch the viewpoint of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], although the gentleman from Texas called attention to the fact that he had to fire his furnace and carry out his garbage can. That is an interesting thing, and I hope that Mr. Berryman, the well-known cartoonist, will not read the Record, because I imagine I can see him getting up one of his celebrated cartoons showing the gentleman from Texas in his long-tailed English walking coat, which he so often wears, carrying a garbage can down the alley. And I am afraid it will bring Congress into a more mirthful attitude before the Nation than it is now.

Here is what I want to go to seriously: I have given some study to the question of fuel saving. I think there is a point that the gentleman might have made, and that is this, that the economical operation of the boilers and the fuel plants out there at Great Lakes can not be carried on by the general run of boys brought into that training school. It is economy to have men who know something about handling those fuel plants. We all know that our former colleague, Dr. Foster, gave a great deal of attention to this question, and it was at his instance that we established a Government fuel yard here in Washington, which was built, and which has saved a great deal of money.

I think it would be the part of wisdom to extend the powers of the Government fuel yard here in Washington, under the direction of the Bureau of Mines, so that they could not only purchase for the departments here in Washington, but that every fuel plant of the Government throughout the Nation, Army posts, and naval stations, and everything else, would be required to submit their requisitions to this fuel yard here, and that the purchases would be made here, and that they should have further authority so that they be given some control over the question of the kinds of fuel plants put in. The erection of most of the fuel plants in the public buildings throughout this country is done not from the standpoint of the economical fuel which is available for that particular plant, but in accordance with some architect's whim, or something else, and by consulting these experts and having their advice on plans and the planning for the fuel plant of any public building, they could then recommend a type of plant suitable for the particular building, and they could recommend the arrangement of the fuel most accessible to the supply, so that you could save millions of dollars throughout the country. Not only that,

but if they were given the purchasing power, you would stop the scandal of coal and fuel being bought for an eastern Army post from some western coal mine, and the purchase of coal for a western Army post at some eastern coal mine, and all that sort of thing. I think we ought to take these fuel plans and treat them as something that requires expert knowledge, and by making proper appropriations for men who do know something about it you could save millions of dollars on your fuel each year.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct not only as to the character and size of coal, but the Scientific American last week came out with a very clever article in which it was shown that 96 or 98 per cent of all the coal burned in the United States goes up the chimney.

Mr. WINGO. Yes; if you take the average apartment house in the city of Washington—and I make that remark from a knowledge of the apartment house that I live in—and the proprietor knew how, he could cut his fuel bill in two. But in his misdirected desire to save money he is making his fuel bill twice what it ought to be, whereas if he would only go over to the Bureau of Mines he would ascertain what kind of coal he should buy and what kind of coal he should use in that equipment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this item for the Great Lakes Naval Training Station was gone into by the committee, as stated by the gentleman from Illinois, very carefully. The committee did not want to cast any reflection on the Committee on Naval Affairs which reported out the bill last year. They reported what was supposed to cover the entire situation. After that the price of coal went up, and it went up about a dollar a ton. We found that the price of coal, after the estimate had been made for \$100,000, had gone down, and by taking the reduction in the price of coal that has been made and applying that over the balance, we found that they could probably get along, as we thought, with \$62,000. That is the reason why we have recommended that sum in the item.

Now, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] that since the committee reported out the bill I have received a letter from the Navy Department that would indicate that they have purchased a part of the coal for the remainder of the year at a higher price. I do not know whether we have cut the amount too much or not. They say they can not possibly get along with less than \$88,700. I would not object to an amendment to that extent, but I do not think we ought to appropriate into a deficiency bill maintenance items that were not estimated for by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am sure that the chairman desires to be very fair in the premises. Let me suggest that when the appropriation bill was framed last year by the Committee on Naval Affairs we arbitrarily cut the amounts for Great Lakes Training Station and every other training station with a view to securing economy.

Mr. GOOD. We know that last year you had an addition of \$75,000. The Secretary asked for only \$500,000, and you got an appropriation of \$575,000.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes. I have here a statement from the commandant of the Great Lakes Naval Training Station, in which he said that coal would cost \$75,400 more this year than last year. Now, the contract under which the coal was furnished does not terminate or die until April 1 this year. They have had all their coal purchased for this year.

Mr. GOOD. They say, notwithstanding that, that they will not need more than \$88,700 for coal.

Mr. BRITTEN. In all fairness to the station, inasmuch as the gentleman realizes that he can not be positive in the premises, I submit that the amount should be increased. The gentleman himself suggested that he would not object to an amendment bringing the amount up to \$88,700.

Why not increase the amount about \$14,000, and let the item go in at \$100,000, just as the Navy Department originally requested? That is the substance of my amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Because that permits them to do something that the Navy Department did not intend they should. If the naval bill goes through as reported, they will have to dismantle some of this plant. We should proceed with great care, therefore, with improvements.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; we are going to dismantle a great portion of the plant, and none of these repairs will, of course, apply to that portion of the property that is to be either returned or salvaged.

Mr. GOOD. I do not believe the gentleman's amendment ought to prevail with regard to the \$100,000, but I think it is quite possible and, indeed, probable that they will need the \$88,700.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRITTEN. I desire to offer an amendment increasing the amount to \$88,700.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BRITTEN: Page 23, line 4, strike out "\$62,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$88,700."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 31, noes 1.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy yard, Mare Island, Calif.: For improvements to central power plant and distributing system, \$23,600.

Mr. BLANTON. I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman what is the use of continuing appropriations for this Mare Island Navy Yard, Calif., if the special select committee that we lately sent out there have determined in their report to do away with that navy yard, that is such a distance from the bright lights of San Francisco that the officers who have to stay there have quite a lot of trouble in getting to San Francisco?

Mr. GOOD. We allowed only a very small part of the estimate, and that was for the improvement of the heating plant, which must be made right away.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows what is in the wind with regard to this yard?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes; but that is not involved in this at all.

Mr. BLANTON. In regard to building a navy yard a little closer to San Francisco, for the special benefit of those officers out there.

Mr. GOOD. That matter will come up on another bill, but this is just to make some needed repairs.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is preparing to meet that issue, is he?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; when we reach it.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. HICKS. I want to say that probably the gentleman will not be in Congress when Mare Island is given up as a construction yard. The report to which the gentleman has referred does not contemplate that Mare Island shall be given up in the near future as a great construction and repair yard.

Mr. BLANTON. But what about that new base that they are preparing?

Mr. HICKS. That is a naval base, an operating base, entirely distinct and separate in its conception from a great construction yard.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to tell the gentleman that I will be in Congress when that item comes up, and I am going to be on the side of the people in fighting it.

Mr. HICKS. Which side is that?

Mr. BLANTON. That is against the gentleman.

Mr. BRITTEN. On the naval side.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts: The limitation specified in the Naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921 on expenditures for pay of chemists and for clerical, inspection, and messenger service in the supply and accounting departments of the navy yards and naval stations and disbursing offices for the fiscal year 1921, under "Maintenance, Supplies and Accounts," is increased by \$750,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this paragraph, that this change of the limitation is unauthorized by law and is new legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. GOOD. The item is not subject to a point of order. Last year's bill fixed a limitation of \$3,500,000 that could be used for a given purpose out of the appropriation. Without that limitation they could have expended the total appropriation for that purpose. What we have done here is not to increase the appropriation, but simply to increase the limitation. Now, when that item was up for consideration before, instead of putting on a limitation of \$3,500,000 we could have placed a limitation of \$4,250,000 and it would not have been subject to a point of order. It has been found that it will be necessary to spend more money for this purpose during the next year, and

this simply increases the amount fixed in the limitation of the current appropriation that can be used for a certain purpose.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman remembers the fight we had over this item, and he remembers that at the beginning, when this was offered as an amendment to increase this, the Chair sustained the point of order against the whole item, and the limitation was put in after the point of order had been sustained. That is my recollection of it. The gentleman remembers the fight that was made by the gentleman from Massachusetts and it was held up for two or three days. Clearly this is not a deficiency, and I make the point of order that it is not a deficiency.

Mr. GOOD. It seems that where Congress has put on a limitation that to increase the limitation is admissible because it is purely a limitation.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Iowa is in error. The facts are that the item deals with current law and the limitation is in the current law. There is no permanent legislation on the question. The point is that in making the current appropriation bill the House put on a limitation for this purpose, that the general sum appropriated should not for this specific purpose exceed three and a half million dollars. So far as this item is concerned and so far as this bill is concerned, it makes no difference whether it is permanent law or current law. There is an "existing law" which this changes. It being a change of law, then, it can only be in order because it is a limitation or a reduction. It is neither, but, as a matter of fact, removes to a certain extent a limitation, and increases instead of decreases. The point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not contended that this item is authorized by statute law, but at best only by current law as carried in the appropriation bill of 1921. In that bill, in that provision which generally applies to the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, there is a proviso which runs as follows:

*Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for chemists and for clerical, inspection, and messenger service in the supply and accounting departments of the navy yards and naval stations and disbursing offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, shall not exceed \$3,500,000.

That is the proviso which this particular item undertakes to amend. It is clear to the Chair that if there is any law at all on the subject, it is current law, and that the intention of this paragraph is to change the existing law.

The Chair is familiar with the rulings holding that items carried in an appropriation bill create law at least for the year in which the appropriation is carried. It seems to the Chair that is an attempt to change the current law, or at least to extend the limitation provided in the current law. It seems to the Chair that if this item in the bill was in order it would be idle to put any limitation on an appropriation bill in current law. The Chair feels compelled to sustain the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fuel and transportation: For coal and other fuel for steamers' and ships' use, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, \$20,000,000.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEARS: Page 24, after line 23, insert as a new paragraph:

"The Navy Department is authorized to pay to Mr. and Mrs. Clifton Cates, of 530 William Street, Key West, Fla., such sum as may be found to be due them by the Government for rent of rooms by Lieuts. Mayer and Myers during the months of April and May, 1918, there being no Government quarters available."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. GOOD. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this paragraph although I realize that it is subject to the point of order, with the hope of getting some information. The facts are that in May, 1918, Lieuts. Mayer and Myers, of the Navy, were left at Key West when no Government quarters were available for them. Rooms were rented from Mr. and Mrs. Cates by a Government official of the Navy Department, and these two lieutenants took possession of the rooms. The total amount claimed by Mr. and Mrs. Cates, as I understand it, is \$63. They have been trying to get this amount ever since 1918, and while the Navy Department acknowledges that the claim is meritorious, they state that this amount can not be paid without some law, the comptroller having ruled that it can not be paid. I have left the amount open, because the Navy Department may not agree that



\$63 is the proper amount, simply with the hope of trying to collect it.

Only yesterday we passed an act appropriating several hundred million dollars in behalf of the railroads of the country, and I voted for the measure, and it does seem to me that some plan should be devised for paying these small claims of private citizens similar to the one included in my motion.

Mr. GOOD. I would say to the gentleman that we had some hearings on the matter, but inasmuch as the amount asked for was indefinite, and as the gentleman's amendment is indefinite, and inasmuch as it is legislation, we did not feel that we ought to enter that realm. If the amount were fixed and the gentleman knew it to be fixed at \$63, I would not object to the amendment.

Mr. SEARS. Then, I will ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by inserting the amount, \$63.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment in the manner indicated. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment. This is a claim, and it ought to go to the Committee on Claims.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to sincerely thank the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the steering committee, for keeping this lady out of what she is justly entitled to and—

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not talking to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SEARS. Then I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. [After a pause.] I withdraw it, because even though the gentleman from Illinois wants to be mean, I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Repairs of barracks, Marine Corps: Repairs and improvements to barracks, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, \$150,000.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HICKS for Mr. BUTLER: Page 25, line 25, after the figures "1921," insert: "and including not to exceed \$850 for painting the gymnasium at Quantico, Va."

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of offering the amendment is this: In passing let me say that I doubt very much if it is subject to the point of order, for it is for maintenance, but the gentleman has reserved it, and I want to address myself to the amendment. At Quantico, Va., as the members of the committee know, we have a great training camp for marines. There is a gymnasium there, and the foundations were constructed entirely by the enlisted men. They contributed their time and labor during their times of recreation. The cement was supplied them by the department, and they have furnished that gymnasium from canteen and entertainment funds, and included in its equipment is a fine organ which cost the men several thousand dollars. They now want to paint the building. Many of these men are painters by trade; that is one of the things we are teaching them in the vocational training school. They are willing to give their time, from their recreation and rest, in order that the gymnasium may be painted, but they do ask that the paint shall be supplied by the Government. That is all they are asking. They are willing to give their labor and time and paint the gymnasium, and in view of their energy and thrift, always so manifest in the Marine Corps, I feel this amendment should carry. It is a Government building, and if the Government will supply them with the material which will cost \$850, they will do the rest.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. So I sincerely hope the gentleman from Arkansas will not make a point of order against this item.

Mr. WINGO. This is not for painting the Government barracks down there; this is for painting the gymnasium.

Mr. HICKS. This is for the gymnasium which the men use for their own pleasure, and for which they have contributed their money and time.

Mr. WINGO. Is it to be painted inside or out?

Mr. HICKS. It is to be painted on the outside I know. I am not sure whether it is to be painted on the inside also.

Mr. BRITTEN. May I suggest to the gentleman this building was completed out of funds taken out of the Marine Corps canteen? They had no proper gymnasium, no recreation place; they

had no organ down there. Marines always care for themselves. It does not make any difference where you see a marine company or detachment, they care for themselves in every direction. This building is constructed of partly new lumber, never having been painted, and should be painted. They need paint, and are willing to apply it themselves.

Mr. WINGO. What size building is it?

Mr. BRITTEN. I do not know; it may be 180 or 190 feet long.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is a work that is most deserving of our cordial support where men will do this of their own volition, and I believe the gentleman from Arkansas sees the value of this when it can be done at such a nominal expense to the Government.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest this is purely a maintenance amendment. The building has never been painted. It ought to be painted and ought to be maintained, the same as the other buildings down there are maintained and painted. The Marine Corps personnel will paint the building—

Mr. WINGO. I will make this trade with the gentleman, that if he will stop talking I will withdraw my reservation.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman also be in favor of the amendment?

Mr. WINGO. I will withdraw my reservation of the point of order if the gentleman will stop talking.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn, and the question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Department of the Interior, public buildings.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I now renew my point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty gentlemen are present, not a quorum, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ackerman	Emerson	Kitchin	Reavis
Anthony	Evans, Nev.	Kieciska	Reed, N. Y.
Ashbrook	Fairfield	Lampert	Reed, W. Va.
Ayres	Ferris	Langley	Rhodes
Babka	Fisher	Lankford	Riordan
Bacharach	Focht	Layton	Robinson, N. C.
Baer	Fordney	Lee, Ga.	Rodenberg
Bankhead	Frear	Leshner	Rouse
Barkley	Freeman	Linthicum	Rowan
Bell	Fuller	Loneragan	Rowe
Benson	Gallagher	McAndrews	Rucker
Bland, Ind.	Gallivan	McArthur	Sanders, Ind.
Bland, Mo.	Gandy	McCulloch	Sanders, La.
Boles	Gard	McDuffie	Sanders, N. Y.
Bowers	Garrett	McGlennon	Sanford
Bowling	Glynn	McKiniry	Scott
Brinson	Godwin, N. C.	McKinley	Scully
Brooks, Ill.	Goldfogle	McLane	Sells
Browne	Goodall	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sherwood
Brumbaugh	Goodwin, Ark.	Maher	Shreve
Buchanan	Goodykoontz	Major	Siegel
Burke	Gould	Mann, Ill.	Sims
Butler	Graham, Pa.	Mann, S. C.	Small
Caldwell	Griffin	Mapes	Smith, Idaho
Candler	Hamilton	Martin	Smith, Ill.
Cannon	Harrell	Mason	Smith, Mich.
Cantrill	Harrison	Mays	Smith, N. Y.
Carew	Hawley	Mead	Stegall
Casey	Hays	Minahan, N. J.	Stedman
Chindblom	Hersey	Montague	Steele
Christopherson	Hersman	Moon	Stevenson
Clark, Fla.	Hill	Mooney	Stinnes
Clark, Mo.	Hoey	Moore, Va.	Sullivan
Classon	Holland	Morrin	Taylor, Tenn.
Coady	Houghton	Mudd	Towner
Cole	Howard	Neely	Upshaw
Cooper	Huddleston	Nelson, Mo.	Vare
Copley	Hull, Iowa	Nelson, Wis.	Venable
Costello	Humphreys	Nicholls	Vestal
Crago	Igoe	Nolan	Vinson
Currie, Mich.	Jacoway	O'Connell	Voigt
Dale	James, Mich.	Oldfield	Volk
Davey	Johnson, Ky.	Oliver	Walters
Dempsey	Johnson, Miss.	Olney	Weaver
Dent	Johnson, S. Dak.	Padgett	Welty
Dewalt	Johnson, Wash.	Paige	Whaley
Dickinson, Iowa	Johnston, N. Y.	Parker	White, Me.
Dickinson, Mo.	Jones, Pa.	Patterson	Wilson, Ill.
Dominick	Jones, Tex.	Peters	Wilson, La.
Donovan	Kahn	Porter	Wise
Dooling	Kearns	Pou	Wright
Doremus	Keller	Radcliffe	Yates
Doughton	Kelley, Mich.	Rainey, Ala.	Young, N. Dak.
Dupré	Kennedy, Iowa	Rainey, John W.	Young, Tex.
Echols	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramsey	Zihlman
Elliott	Kettner	Ramsayer	
Ellsworth	Kincheloe	Randall, Calif.	
Elston		Rayburn	

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill H. R. 15962, the

general deficiency bill, finding itself without a quorum, he had caused the roll to be called, and that 199 Members, a quorum, had answered to their names, and that he presented therewith a list of the absentees for insertion in the Journal and Record.

#### DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### OFFICE OF THE SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

For inland transportation by railroad routes, \$35,650,000.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEENERSON: Line 7, page 31, strike out "\$35,650,000" and insert "\$34,850,000."

Mr. STEENERSON. I understand this is satisfactory?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, there was included in this item about \$800,000 for airplane service, that they expected to expend. You have simply stricken out that amount?

Mr. STEENERSON. That is all.

Mr. GOOD. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### UNITED STATES HOUSING CORPORATION.

Salaries: For officers, clerks, and other employees in the District of Columbia necessary to collect and account for the receipts from the sale of properties of the United States Housing Corporation, the Bureau of Industrial Housing and Transportation, property commandeered by the United States through the Department of Labor, and to collect the amounts advanced to transportation facilities and others, \$35,000: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$5,000 per annum and only one person may be employed at that rate.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The last two paragraphs, I note, are under the head of salaries, and that work seems to be limited to the collection and accounting for receipts from the sale of property. What is the necessity for so much expense in collecting the amount due?

Mr. GOOD. They are selling all the property, and my understanding is that their total expense for the collection here in Washington, in running the entire establishment, is less than four-fifths of 1 per cent of the amount collected. They are selling all this property, as I said, but they have not sold it all. There is some property in Syracuse and some property in California they are about to sell, and they are getting the houses well disposed of. It has been a tremendous task, as the gentleman can understand, when they are selling this property to persons for homes, and it has meant thousands of individual sales.

Mr. WINGO. Does that include deferred payments, or are they cash sales?

Mr. GOOD. That includes the actual collection, as I understand.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman did not catch the question. The sales are made in some instances on deferred payments?

Mr. GOOD. I think practically all of the property is sold on deferred payments. Most of it is sold under contract.

Mr. WINGO. And the provisions carried in these two separate items are to cover that accounting and the office force that is incident thereto. It is not a question of litigation at all.

Mr. GOOD. Not at all, except one of these items is to provide for the funds where there is a foreclosure or something of that kind.

Mr. WINGO. There was no particular piece of litigation that you had in mind? It is the current expense of the office force that is looking after the sales that are to be made?

Mr. GOOD. That is correct.

Mr. FARRISH. Does the gentleman know whether they pay any commission in connection with the sale of these houses?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; there have been some commissions paid.

Mr. FARRISH. Does this appropriation cover that item or not?

Mr. GOOD. No; this does not. It is simply for the collection of the money. Wherever there is a commission charge, my understanding is it is paid out of the receipts. They have authority to pay it that way. But I understand their commissions have been very modest.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Washington, District of Columbia, Government hotel for Government workers: For maintenance, operation, and management of the hotel and restaurant therein, including personal services, \$45,000: *Provided*, That

no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$5,000 per annum, and only one person may be employed at that rate.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Is this item for the group of buildings down here on the Plaza?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. And the maintenance, operation, and management of that hotel and restaurant is costing us \$5,000 a year in addition to what they get out of it?

Mr. GOOD. No. The estimate is that there will be something of a surplus. The total cost of running the hotel is about \$1,000,000 a year, and the income is a little over that. This amount here was made necessary because of the application of the minimum wage law in the District of Columbia, which added \$75,000 to their expenses over and above what was estimated.

Mr. WINGO. Possibly my inquiry was predicated upon lack of information of the legislative regulations. As I recall, we simply make the appropriation, but make it payable out of the receipts?

Mr. GOOD. No. The receipts are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and we make a direct appropriation for the expense. So we have a record of the receipts.

Mr. WINGO. So in the current law you appropriate the money that was estimated would cover the expenses?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. The item of deficiency is because of the increase under the minimum wage law?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; the minimum wage law.

Mr. WINGO. And the receipts that are coming in and that are covered into the Treasury are going to cover all the expenses, even including this?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and producing a surplus.

Mr. WINGO. Is it the intention to continue this hotel and restaurant indefinitely, or is it intended soon to dispense with them?

Mr. GOOD. I think it is the plan as soon as possible to wreck those buildings. They ought to be wrecked in the near future. Just how long it will be necessary to continue the hotel I can not state.

Mr. WINGO. I can not recall whether the sundry civil bill carried an appropriation for this fiscal year or not. Does the gentleman remember?

Mr. GOOD. An appropriation is carried next year for that service. It is thought that some time next year there will be some disposition made of the whole subject.

Mr. WINGO. To what particular class of employees does that apply?

Mr. GOOD. Practically all of the employees are under the law. Their compensation is fixed by a compensation commission. The waitresses and help of that kind have their salaries fixed.

Mr. WINGO. If the increase costs \$45,000, the natural inquiry arises in my mind whether they must not have a big lot of cooks and chambermaids down there to take care of those young ladies.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; they have a great many.

Mr. WINGO. I understand they have 1,800 people there, and the increase, which was a very small percentage after all, would make a \$45,000 increase, just for chambermaids and cooks for 1,800 ladies?

Mr. GOOD. My recollection is that about 500 persons are employed.

Mr. WINGO. I say 1,800 guests, and it takes 400 or 500 chambermaids and cooks?

Mr. GOOD. About 1,800 guests are provided with accommodations, and about 500 waitresses and clerks and employees of all kinds are employed.

Mr. WINGO. With that number, I presume, there is no complaint about the treatment they are getting now?

Mr. GOOD. I understand not.

Mr. WINGO. They should be satisfied.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, during the war we had an elaborate housing commission, which had charge of these Government houses. I would like to know if the same housing commission has charge of this Government property?

Mr. GOOD. No. It is under the Secretary of Labor now. The Housing Bureau is now a bureau of the Department of Labor.



Mr. McCLINTIC. Does the gentleman know how long it is intended to maintain these buildings?

Mr. GOOD. No; I will say to the gentleman that I do not know. That will depend somewhat on future legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, \$105,500: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriations heretofore made and available for expenditure by the United States Housing Corporation shall be expended for the purposes for which appropriations are made herein.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the committee do now rise. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### COLD STORAGE BILL (S. DOC. NO. 377).

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on Agriculture, presented for printing under the rule the conference report and accompanying statement on the bill (H. R. 9521) to prevent hoarding and deterioration of and deception with respect to cold-storage foods, to regulate shipments of cold-storage foods in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

The SPEAKER. The conference report is ordered printed under the rule.

Mr. WALSH. What is it?

The SPEAKER. The conference report on the cold storage bill.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Wingo] reserved all points of order?

The SPEAKER. Yes. That is not necessary.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, according to previous order, until to-morrow, Thursday, February 10, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

407. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting supplemental report in connection with claims arising under the provisions of section 9 of "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," on account of road construction in various States; to the Committee on Roads.

408. A letter from the Farm Loan Commissioner, transmitting report by the Federal Farm Loan Board (H. Doc. No. 998); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SNYDER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3737) to carry out the provisions of an act approved July 1, 1902, known as the act entitled "An act to accept, ratify, and confirm a proposed agreement submitted by the Kansas or Kaw Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes," and to provide for a settlement to Addie May Auld and Archie William Auld, who were enrolled as members of the said tribe after the lands and moneys of said tribe had been divided, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1308), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KAHN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3125) authorizing the Secretary of War to transfer certain surplus machine tools and other equipment to the Federal Board for Vocational Education, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No.

1309), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANGLEY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15831) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell a portion of the Federal building site in the city of Duquoin, Ill., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1310), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 4924) to retrocede to the State of Virginia exclusive jurisdiction heretofore acquired by the United States of America over the property and persons of the town site or territory known as United States Housing Corporation project 150A, located in Norfolk County, State of Virginia, and called Craddock, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1311), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DYER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16043) to authorize the incorporation of companies to promote trade in China, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1312), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 16060) to amend the interstate commerce act by adding thereto a new section, No. 20b, and to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, by adding a new paragraph to section 10 thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 16061) authorizing the bestowal upon the unknown, unidentified British soldier buried in Westminster Abbey and the unknown French soldier buried in the Arc de Triomphe of the congressional medal of honor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OGDEN: A bill (H. R. 16062) to create a cause of action for compensation in damages for injuries sustained and death resulting from injuries to any person through the wrongful act or omission by an agent, officer, or employee of the United States Government, and to provide the procedure therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 16063) authorizing the readjustment of certain star route and powerboat mail contracts; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 16064) directing the Mississippi River Commission to make an examination and survey of the Atchafalaya, Red, and Black Rivers and to report plan for protection of their basins from flood waters of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 16065) to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 16066) to authorize the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, to grant permits for certain installations in public grounds under his control in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16067) for the erection of a vault building for the use of the Treasury Department, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. OGDEN: Resolution (H. Res. 677) directing the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to furnish the House of Representatives certain information; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, in connection with the sale of supplies by the War Department; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 16068) granting a pension to Florence Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 16069) granting an increase of pension to Alice D. Knight; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 16070) granting a pension to Maurice Roach; to the Committee on Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5615. By Mr. CALDWELL: Petition of representatives of the pearl button workers of the Eastern States, New York, favoring a high tariff on pearl buttons and pearl novelties and on cut blanks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5616. Also, petition of Henry L. Doherty & Co., of New York, favoring the passage of the Nolan bill; to the Committee on Patents.

5617. By Mr. DYER: Petition of Mrs. Theodore Benoist, Myrtle Wheeler, Maureen King, John A. Mueller and others, C. Schmitz and others, G. S. Wiehms, Luke E. Hart, Julia Ginder, W. E. Lindsey, Mrs. J. H. Boyes, Mrs. Alice McWash, Josephine Behler, Loretto Degzhardt, Beatrice Brown, J. Robson, and William F. Hendrix, all of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5618. Also, petition of the Mothers' Club, Frank A. Aug, and others, all of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; also petition of J. A. Meyer, of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5619. Also, petition of Mrs. L. E. Thorn, L. A. Peabody, Oliver J. Voelpel, Clara A. Duerr, Mr. and Mrs. J. H. Biermann, Mrs. Helen Risse, Alice P. Moskop, Jennie J. Kuehl, R. J. Pietz, Sadie C. Pounds, Walter N. Gindra, H. Floerchinger, Christina Peters, John E. Massengale, D. M. Haskin, Clara Belle Haskin, Mrs. Charles S. Gerber, Mrs. J. A. Life, Mr. and Mrs. F. R. Thorn, Mrs. Mae F. Meyer, Henry Ries, Mrs. Edward Orr, Ernst Lewitz, Mrs. E. Lewitz, Sabine Coleman, Laura R. Moskop, Magdalene M. Willis, Mrs. Jennie B. Bartlow, A. C. Cecelia Schoknecht, James B. Farrell, Emma Ochterbeck, Miss E. Loch, and Lucy M. Hayes, protesting against Capper-Fess bill; to the Committee on Education.

5620. Also, petition of Mrs. Cornelia E. Hildebrand, Lillian Schultz, Matthew Voney, Norma B. Voney, Lillian Voney, O. J. Fickelissen, Dorothy Koetzli, Sadie M. Sankup, and Nat. L. McGuire, all of St. Louis, protesting against the Capper-Fess bill; to the Committee on Education.

5621. Also, petition of Mrs. L. Finger and E. M. Finger, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of House bill 160; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5622. By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of certain citizens of New York City, opposing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5623. By Mr. EDMONDS: Petition of the New Century Club of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 14469; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5624. Also, petition of Donald T. Shenton Post, No. 130, the American Legion, Philadelphia, Pa., urging Congress to pass legislation affecting former service men; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5625. By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the reduction in the appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5626. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of John H. Barlow, chairman conference of All Friends, Philadelphia, Pa., regarding world disarmament and economic reconstruction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5627. Also, petition of residents of Sauk County, Wis., favoring beer and light wines and protesting against the Sunday blue law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5628. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Commissioner W. A. L. Bazeley, department of conservation, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urging favorable action on appropriation of \$300,000 in deficiency bill to complete gypsy-moth work in cooperation with the States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5629. Also, petition of Commissioner Arthur W. Gilbert, department of agriculture, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urging restoration of an appropriation of \$214,000 for white-pine blister rust work; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5630. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of Rev. M. D. Collins and others, of the fourteenth congressional district of Missouri, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5631. By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5632. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition of citizens of Chilton, Wis., protesting against the so-called Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5633. By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the Connecticut Council of Catholic Women, protesting against the Smith-Towner bill because it is un-American, unconstitutional, and economically and politically unsound; to the Committee on Education.

5634. By Mr. MANN of Illinois: Petition of certain citizens of Chicago, Ill., favoring an amendment to the Volstead law and protesting against the Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5635. By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of the faculty and student body of St. Mary's Theological Seminary, of West Norwalk, Conn., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5636. By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of Cuyahoga County Council, the American Legion, Cleveland, Ohio, representing 31 American Legion posts, urging the immediate passage of S. 4613 and H. R. 14961; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5637. By Mr. MORIN: Petition of members of St. Augustine's parish, Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5638. Also, petition of the Ladies' Aid Society of St. Paul's Cathedral, Mrs. Joseph Kunkel, president, of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5639. Also, petition of Rev. Philip Knapfer, O. M. Cap, and others, of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5640. Also, petition of the Holy Spirit Greek Catholic Church, of Pittsburgh, Pa., Dr. Thoe M. Vasochik, rector, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5641. Also, petition of members of the Physical Education Club of the University of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging passage of Fess-Capper bill; to the Committee on Education.

5642. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the White Motor Co., of New York, asking the passage of bills to stimulate foreign trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5643. By Mr. OGDEN: Petition of the Louisville Real Estate Board, Louisville, Ky., opposing the passage of the Ralston-Nolan bill, H. R. 12397, also H. R. 14157; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5644. Also, petition of certain citizens of Louisville, Ky., protesting against the occupation of Germany by French colonial troops; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5645. By Mr. PAIGE: Petition of the Outlook Club, of Orange, Mass., protesting against commercializing our national parks; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

5646. Also, petition of Division No. 2, Ancient Order of Hibernians, No. 292, of Fitchburg, Mass.; Charles T. McMurray, Fitchburg, Mass.; Edmond Chapdelain, president of the Association of Catholic Men and Women, West Warren, Mass.; and James H. Nellie L., and Mary A. Sheehan, of Fitchburg, Mass., opposing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5647. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Clinton, Mass., indorsing the Smith-Towner and Sheppard-Towner bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5648. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of Renville County, N. Dak., asking for the enactment of legislation providing Federal aid for farmers to enable them to plant crops in the spring of 1921; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5649. Also, petition of citizens of western North Dakota, favoring the passage of H. R. 15453, guaranteeing a price of \$2.25 for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5650. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of the National Council of Catholic Women, Pittsburgh, Pa.; E. F. Quinn, of Beaver Falls, Pa.; F. A. Stewart, New Brighton, Pa.; Jos. H. Reiman, supreme president, Knights of St. George in the State of Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Pa.; and the Charleroi Council, Knights of Columbus, No. 956, of Charleroi, Pa., opposing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5651. By Mr. ZIEHLMAN: Petition of the Board of Charities of the District of Columbia, favoring a home for the care of the feeble-minded; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5652. Also, petition of the American Chamber of Commerce, Manila, P. I., for amendment to revenue act, 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.